AN ANSWER

TO A

Letter to Dr. Sherlock,

by Lord Bp. of Lond.

WRITTEN IN

Vindication of that part of *Josephus's History*, which gives the Account of *Jaddus's* Submission to *Alexander*, against the *Answer* to the Piece, entituled, *Obedience* and *Submission* to the Present Government.

By the same Author.

LONDON,

Printed in the Year, M.DC.XCII.

(14)

AN

ANSWER

TO A

Letter to Dr. Sherlock,

WRITTEN IN

Vindication of that part of *Josephus's History* which gives the Account of *Jaddus's* Submission to *Alexander*, against the *Answer* to the Piece entituled, *Obedience* and *Submission* to the Present Government.

By the same Author.

913:15

LONDON,

Printed in the Year, MDCXCII.

AN ANSWER TO A LETTER to Dr. *SHERLOCK*, &c.

THE preſent Controverſie concerning the Caſe of *Jaddus*, conſiſts of theſe two parts; as it reſpects the Story it ſelf, and as it reſpects the *Convocation*'s Senſe of it.

I. As it reſpects the Story it ſelf; and here I had urged two Things: 1. *That it is ſuſpitious.* And, 2. *If it were true, it would not prove what it is alleadged for.* Anſw. p. 5

1. *That the Story it ſelf is ſuſpitious.* And here it is ſufficient to obſerve, that what I deſigned to prove, was that the Story of *Jaddus* and *Alexander*, as it is repreſented by *Joſephus*, is *doubtfull* and *ſuſpitious*, and not that it is abſolutely *falſe*, the *Doubtfulneſs* of it being ſufficient to my purpoſe; which was to ſhew, "That no Argument can be drawn "from the Example of *Jaddus*, to juſtifie Submiſſion to a Poſſeſſour of "Power, notwithſtanding an Oath to a lawfull King, who is alive, and "inſiſts upon his Right. This is the uſe which ſome Men make of it, and which our *Author* vindicates: And the *Uncertainty* of the Story is a good Argument againſt that, though it be not charged with direct Falſehood: For if it be *onely ſuſpitious*, it may be true, or it may be falſe; but if it be *onely ſuſpitious*, it cannot be argumentative; and no regular Inference can be drawn from it, in reference to Practice; and accordingly that which I draw from thence is, "That it is very unreaſo- P. 12. "nable to make an Argument, or draw any Inference, in reference to P. 9. "Practice, from ſuch a *doubtfull* and *ſuſpitious* Story.—— The *Suſpition* affects the Exemplarineſs of it, as much as the direct *Falſhood*; and a *doubtfull* Example is as unſerviceable to make a Precedent, as one that is notoriouſly *falſe*: So that in this Controverſie there is ſome Difference between this *Author* and my ſelf. It is not neceſſary for me to prove the Story falſe; but it is neceſſary for him, and all that urge this Example, or act upon it, or produce it to countenance their Practices, to prove it *true*, and to clear it from thoſe Doubts and Difficulties with

which it is encumbred; which notwithſtanding our *Author* is ſo far from doing, that, if poſſible, he hath made it more intricate and difficult than it was before.

In order to make this Charge good againſt him, I ſhall onely premiſe, (and which he does not deny,) That this Story ſtands purely upon the Credit and Authority of *Joſephus*; now if this Author himſelf, notwithſtanding his pretending to vindicate *Joſephus*, does give as little Credit to *Joſephus*'s Chronology as I do, if the Account that he hath given makes *Joſephus* as much miſtaken as that which I have given; then he himſelf, for all his fair Words of him, reflects as much upon *Joſephus*, and in the Civility of his own Language makes him a *Lyar*; and that I hope is no
P. 12. extraordinary Reaſon to relie upon his Authority, nor to draw a practical Inference from an Example that ſtands upon nothing elſe but the Relation of *Joſephus*. And this is plainly the Caſe in the Account this Author gives of the times in which *Ezra*, and eſpecially *Nehemiah*, lived, which differs from *Joſephus*'s Account but *ninety* and odd Years, as we ſhall ſee preſently; ſo that for any thing I can ſee, the *Authority* of *Joſephus*, though the Author lays it down as the Foundation of the Controverſie, is in truth no Diſpute between us; for he himſelf regards his Authority as little as I do, onely he differs from him in one Inſtance, and I in another; but that I think is not much, with reſpect to the Authority of *Joſephus*. The Author indeed, to ſmooth the buſineſs, calls his Book *A Vindication of* Joſephus; and if he had pleaſed, he might have called it *A Confutation of* Joſephus, and it would have done as well; for it is but a ſcurvy kind of *Vindication*, when to vindicate one Paſſage in an Author, a Man is forced to impeach his Credit as much in another: So that if our Author has any thing to ſay for the Story, I deſire him for his own ſake, hereafter not to tell his Adverſary, *That his Complaint*
P. 5. *of Difficulties proceeded onely from an eager deſire to find faults in that Story of* Joſephus, except he himſelf could vindicate *that Story*, without finding as many and as great Faults in another Story of the ſame *Joſephus*. I deſire him likewiſe not to build too much on the *Authority* of *Joſephus*, except he can give us a Reaſon why the *Authority* of *Joſephus* is unqueſtionable in the Caſe of *Jaddus*, but of no value at all in the Caſe of *Nehemiah*.

But to doe our Author Juſtice, he hath as little to ſay for the *Story* it ſelf, as he hath for the Authority of *Joſephus*; and this will appear upon Examining what he ſays in the *Vindication*. He begins with what I ſay
P. 2. of the *Suſpitionſneſs* of the Story, and my firſt Argument he tells us was, That,

1. No Author beſides *Joſephus*, and thoſe that had it from him, *mentions or takes notice* of any ſuch thing. Now this our Author does not deny, and an indifferent Man at firſt ſight would be apt to imagine that this

this was a considerable Prejudice against any Story vouched by a single Author, especially if the Matter of it be of extraordinary Remark, and eminently merits the notice of an *Historian*, as is the Case before us: And when I mentioned such grave Authors, and of undoubted Credit, as *Diodorus Siculus*, *Plutarch*, *Quintus Curtius*, *Arrian*, and *Justin*, who have transmitted to us the whole Progress of *Alexander*, none of which have the least word or intimation, either of *Jaddus* or *Jerusalem*, though if the Story be true, it is the most famous and memorable part of *Alexander*'s History; one would have thought there should have been some plain and clear Reason given of their Pretermission, before such a Story be admitted for authentick, and more especially before it be insisted on to justifie Practice in a most high and important Case. But all this is nothing with our Author, and he wipes it out with a wet Finger: *For*, says he, *this Argument lies against all that* Josephus *has written of the* Jewish *Affairs, within the Historical Time of the Heathens, except what he takes out of* Scripture, *and out of the Books of the* Maccabees; *for we have no other ancient* Jewish *History*. And why so, I pray? Was the History of *Alexander* a History of the *Jewish Affairs?* Or, was the Conquest of *Judæa* confined to the Countrey, and a Secret to all the World besides? As *Josephus* tells the Story, the whole Scene was acted in the Face of a foreign Army, and to their great wonderment; and of those that were present the Foreigners were far more numerous: And yet forsooth, a thing so remarkable in itself, and, as *Josephus* tells it, so particularly remark'd, and so notorious and publick, our Author would have us believe to be Matter onely of National Record, and could by no means get out of the Territories of *Judæa*. And he talks of the Conquest of a Countrey, as if it had been like their municipal Laws, and particular Customs, and known to none but the Natives and Inhabitants: And accordingly he tells us, *If there had been any other* Jewish *Historian, that had written the Things of* Alexander's *Time, and said nothing of this Story of* Jaddus, *nor of* Jaddus *himself, (for his living is then questioned by our Objector,) then indeed there had been great occasion to say, that their Silence had made this Story suspitious; but when there is no* Jewish *Writer, that pretends to write a History of those Times, in this Case to argue against the Authority of* Josephus, *onely from the Silence of* Heathen *Historians, this seems to be very unjust and unreasonable.* Now as to *Jewish Historians* writing of the *Things* of *Alexander*'s Time, the Author I think is a little mistaken; for the Author of the History of the *Maccabees*, who wrote much nearer the Time of *Alexander* than *Josephus*, hath taken notice of the Things of *Alexander*'s *Time*, and makes it introductory to his Book, and more particularly to the Affairs of *Judæa*, and yet he takes as little notice of *Alexander*'s coming to *Jerusalem*, or his subduing it, as the *Heathen Historians* themselves: And *Julius Africanus*, who, as our Author saith, lived

1 *Maccab.* ch. 1.

in

in that Country, and wrote some time after *Josephus*, and says nothing
P. 9, 10. of this Story neither; and our Author says, *that living in the same Country, he might have his Information from them that knew as well as* Josephus *himself:* So that if our Author thinks it so very material, the *Jewish Historians* also are perfectly silent in this Matter. But why *Jewish Historian?* Could no body take notice of the Conquest of *Judea* by *Alexander* but a *Jew*, and a Conquest more considerable than all the rest, as being attended with such wonderful and stupendious Circumstances? I grant him that neither *Diodorus Siculus*, nor *Plutarch*, &c. were *Jews*, nor did they undertake to write the *Jewish* History; but they wrote the Life and Expedition of *Alexander*, and this is a considerable part of that; and I wonder what Reason can be given, why they should pretermit the extraordinary Conquest and Submission of *Judea*, any more than they did the Conquest of *Tyre*, *Egypt*, *Persia*, or *India*; for neither were these Authors *Tyrians*, *Egyptians*, *Persians*, nor *Indians*. And it is unaccountable, that those who descend to such minute Circumstances, to his Sleep, Dreams, taking Physick, should yet silently pass over the most remarkable Passage of the whole, and which deserved the Notice and Record of an Historian, as much or more than the Battel at *Issus*, or at
Answ. p. 6. *Gaugamela*, or any other matter whatsoever. This I had said before, and I am sorry I am forced to repeat it; but the force of the Argument lies in it, and our Author was not pleased to take the least notice of it: He speaks here (by way of diminution and abatement to their Credit) of the Silence of *Heathen* Historians; But why *Heathen Historians?* The Question is a *Matter of Fact*, and no Article of Religion; and I did not know before that a *Right Faith* was necessary to make a good Historian; and if that would make any alteration in the Case, *Josephus* himself was a *Jew*. But let us hear his Reason, *Who knows not that the* Heathens *generally contemned and hated the* Jews, *as being not onely Revilers of their gods, but Enemies to all the rest of Mankind?* Why truly, to answer that Question, I doubt *Josephus* himself did not know it; for he hath taken a great deal of Pains to prove the contrary, and to represent the great *Honour* and *Respect* that was paid to the *Jews* by the *Heathen Nations*, as the Author may find in several places of his *Antiquities*, and more especially in his Book against *Appion*. And I am somewhat in doubt whether our Author *knows* it; for to solve an Inconsistency in this Story, noted by *Salian*, he tells us, *The* Chaldæans, *who after so long acquaintance as they had with the* Jews *in their Captivity, were kinder to them than any other People, and have continued so ever since.* Now as I take it, these *Chaldæans* were *Heathens* as well as other People. He tells us farther, That, excepting the *Phœnicians*, who might doe it upon a point of Interest, upon the score of Trade, *no other Nation could be so intent upon the Spoils of* Jerusalem, *but only for spite.* And adds, *of all the Nations in the World none so likely as*

the

the Samaritans. So then it seems by his own reckoning, this *Hatred* to the *Jews* was not so *general* as he would here insinuate, and though a spiteful *Samaritan* might be suspected of Partiality or Malice, either in declaring or omitting matters relating to the Affairs of *Judea*, there is no reason to extend this to all the rest of the *Heathen* World; and *Diodorus* and the other Authors before mentioned, were not *Samaritans* no more than they were *Jews*. But the truth is, this Business of the *general Hatred of the Heathens to the Jews* is meer Imagination, and hath no Foundation but in the Author's Fancy, for however it may have been since the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and their general Dispersion, and which as a just Judgment of God is fallen upon them for their crucifying the Lord of Life, and concerns *Heathens* no more than it does *Christians*; yet before (and *Diodorus* wrote 160 Years before) no Nation in the World was so much admired, and sought to, and particularly with respect to their Rites and Religion, (the very Reason our Author gives of their Hatred to them,) and besides the many Instances of it in the Scriptures, and in *Josephus*, the infinite number of Proselytes, both of the *Gates* and *Justice*, is a demonstration of it; and (which is not less considerable,) the Eastern and the European Learning was derived from them; and the *Greeks*, who set up for Learning and Improvement in Philosophy, particularly *Pythagoras*, *Plato*, and the rest of the great Men among them, travelled far and near to fetch home the Treasures of other Nations, and particularly of the *Jews*, to enrich themselves, as is made evident by *Josephus*, *Clemens Alexandr.* *Theoph.* *Tatian*, *Origen*, and *Eusebius*; and that which makes their Testimony the more considerable, and rescues them from the Suspition of Partiality, is the Acknowledgment of the Heathen Writers themselves, whose Fragments they have preserved, and made use of them to prove, That *Moses*, and the *Prophets*, and the wise Men among the *Jews* were the Foundations of Literature, and from whose Breasts the *Grecians* suck'd their Knowledg. Besides, even in the lowest and most deplorable Condition of their Common-wealth, the *Jews* were admitted into the Courts of the greatest Princes, and to most noble Offices and Employments, as is evident from the Books of *Ester*, *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Daniel*, and the First and Second of *Esdras*, and many other Examples there are in *Josephus*. And after the Captivity the *Romans* made with them a League offensive and defensive, and at such a time too, when they were in great Distress, and oppressed by *Demetrius*; and heartily espoused their Interest, and writ to *Demetrius* to forbear his ill dealing towards them, otherwise threatening him, that they would *do them justice, and fight with him by Sea and Land.* About the same time they renewed a former League made with *Sparta*, which it seems was first desired by the *Spartans*, where it appears that the *Jews* were so far from being hated and contemned by them, that as a

Josephus against *Apion.* *Clem. Alex.* 1 *lib.* 2. *strom.* 1. *Theoph. ad Autol.* *Tatian. paren. ad Gr.* *Orig. contr. Cels.* *Euseb. præp. l.* 9. *c.* 6.

1 *Maccab.* 8. 20, 21. Ver. 32.

1 *Macca.* 12. 1. *ad* 23.

Matter

Matter of Honour to themſelves, and as an Argument of Friendſhip
Ver. 21. they claim kindred with them; *it is found in Writing that the* Spartans *and* Jews *are Brethren, and come out of the Generation of* Abraham. Now this, and a great deal more that might be ſaid if it were needful, is no great Evidence of that *general Hatred and Contempt* of the *Jews*, which our Author, for want of a better Anſwer, charges upon the *Heathens*. But to gratify him let us ſuppoſe it, and what then? Why, then they would not ſpeak the Truth of them, even though they knew it, and though it lay never ſo much in the Courſe of the Hiſtory they treat of. This I muſt confeſs is round dealing, and at one ſtroke daſhes out all their Reputation, and faſtens as black an Imputation upon them as can be laid upon any Hiſtorian: and methinks our Author who is ſo ready to charge theſe eminent Men with Hatred, and conſequent upon that with Inſincerity, ſhould have had ſome good Reaſon ready to have cleared his own in this Point; for if it be Inſincerity in an Hiſtorian to omit a pertinent Paſſage, out of meer Hatred to the Perſons concerned, 'tis ſomething or other which I will not name, to charge an Hiſtorian with ſuch wofu[illegible] Prevarication, and offer nothing at all in proof of it. And what hath our Author to ſupport this foul Charge? Why truly 'tis all built on one Word, 'tis but calling them *Heathen* Hiſtorians and the Buſineſs is done, and then 'tis as clear as can be, they are guilty of Hatred, Malice, Partiality, Unfaithfulneſs, and all the Vices. And if the Reader will not take this for a very good Reaſon why thoſe Authors omitted this Story of *Jaddus*, I cannot help it, our Author will not afford us any better. He adds indeed, and perhaps he intended it for a Reaſon, *Hence it came to paſs that thoſe Writers he mentions, have ſcarce ever named the* Jews *in their Hiſtories*. A very weighty Reaſon indeed, and therefore they muſt needs *hate* and *contemn* them, by the ſame Reaſon our Author *hates Plutarch*, *Arrian*, *Curtius* and *Juſtin*, for neither doth he *name* them, though the preſent Diſpute is concerning them. But this Author has an excellent Faculty at turning his Reaſons, but four Lines before it was very *unjuſt* and *unreaſonable to argue againſt the Authority of* Joſephus, *only from the ſilence of* Heathen *Hioſtrians*. But now it ſeems their *Silence* is all in all, and the whole Fabrick ſtands upon it, and it is *very juſt* and *reaſonable* from thence to argue againſt their own Authority, and to make them guilty of Baſeneſs; that is to ſay, this ſame *Silence* anſwers as many purpoſes as the *Author* pleaſes; they do not mention a Story that *Joſephus* does, and then they are a parcel of *Heathens*, and their *Silence* ſignifies nothing at all: They do not mention the *Jews* in their Hiſtories, and then they are *Heathens* too; but their *Silence* ſignifies Hatred, Corruption, Want of Fidelity, and I cannot tell what. Well! No body knows what Wonders the ſame thing can do, when it falls into the hands of a Man of Art and Argument: But after all this is pure Miſtake; for

if

if the *naming* the *Jews* will take off this Imputation, and abate our Author's heavy Charge, they have not been so backward in that: 'Tis true indeed they do not go out of their way to name them, and when they have no occasion, which, how kind soever it might be, would not be very pertinent in an Historian; and I suppose they chose rather to mind the Course of their History, than to digress, and mix things foreign, out of pure Complaisance to the *Jews*. But however, if naming the *Jews* in their Writings will reconcile them to our Author's better opinion, if he please to look again, he will find that some of them have *named* them indeed no oftener than they had occasion: *Plutarch* hath a whole Discourse concerning them in his *Symposiacs*, in which there is nothing savouring either of Hatred or Disrespect to them: Neither hath he forgot them in his *Lives*, but hath mentioned them more than once; and, which comes home to our Purpose, he records *Pompey*'s Entrance into *Judea*, and his taking *Aristobulus* Prisoner, his deciding Controversies there, and many other Affairs, by himself and his Officers: And I wonder why this very same *Plutarch* should in his Life of *Pompey* take particular Notice of the Affairs of *Judea*, and of *Pompey*'s Transactions there; and yet in his Life of *Alexander* take no manner of Notice of his being at *Jerusalem*, especially since his being there was, according to *Josephus*, so extraordinary and wonderfull: I doubt the reason is, that he had heard of the one, but not of the other. Our Author adds, *But* Josephus *designed nothing more than to give us a History of the* Jews; even just as the other Historians designed nothing more than to give us a History of *Alexander*. And if it be reasonable to think *Josephus* would omit nothing that was material and extraordinary in the history of his Nation, I hope it is as reasonable to think those other Historians would omit nothing that was very material and extraordinary in the Life of *Alexander*. But this our Author will not allow; for he adds, *How then should* Josephus's *Credit be impeacht by the silence of* Heathen Writers, *especially in a matter which they would be sure to conceal, for that very reason that he had to mention it, namely, because it made for the honour of his Nation?* Now this, if it be a Reason, it has two Edges; for if the Reason of concealing might be the *Hatred* to the *Jews*, and the Reason of mentioning it might be for the *Honour* of them; then the Question is, Whether it be most likely, that the *Honour* of his Nation might tempt *Josephus* to speak more than truth; or the *Hatred* to it might prevail upon all the rest to speak less than Truth of them? Now I can tell our *Author*, that it is no new Complaint, that *Josephus* hath been a little too carefull of the *Honour* of his Nation; and it is not very accountable, how so many several Authors, and of divers Ages and Nations, undertaking to give account of the whole Expedition of *Alexander*, should all of them combine to omit a most famous and remarkable Submission to him, out of pure *Spight* and *Malice* to the Inhabitants. But the truth is, our *Author* is so very tender of the Credit of *Josephus*, that he cares not what

In Pompeio.

he ſays, nor how much he reflects on the Reputation of other Hiſtorians, every way as good, or better than him; and to ſupport *Joſephus*'s Authority, they muſt be repreſented by odious and abominable Characters, and as *deſignedly* and *malitiouſly* concealing plain Matter of Fact; and all this without any manner of Proof, either from the Authors themſelves, or from any other Reaſon, but onely out of pure charitable Conjecture and Suppoſition. This Author tells me, *We ought to take heed of ſuch Arguments as an Adverſary may make uſe of againſt the Goſpel it ſelf*; and I ſay ſo we ought: And though the Compariſon is not equal, yet there is great reaſon to take heed of ſuch Inſinuations as deſtroy the Credit of all Hiſtory; for if a Man without direct and plain Proofs may faſten ſuch Imputations upon Hiſtorians, the ſame Conjectures may as well affect what they deliver, as what they do not; and ſo we may quickly conjecture the Truth of all Hiſtory out of the World: 'Tis but boldly charging them with *Hatred* and *Malice*, and the Work is done, and a Teſtimony from Hiſtory will ſignifie no more than the Authority of a *Romance*. And if *Joſephus*'s Credit in this point cannot be maintained any other way, in my poor Opinion it had better ſhift for itſelf as well as it can, than to ſit thus hard on the Reputation and Vertue of as good Hiſtorians perhaps as the World hath ſeen: And therefore to conclude this point, and as a farther Confirmation of my Aſſertion, I ſhall conſider theſe two things.

P. 3.

1. The general Credit and Reputation thoſe Hiſtorians have always had among learned Men.

2. The particular Advantages they had of informing themſelves of the true Account of the Hiſtory and Expedition of *Alexander*.

1. Their general Credit and Reputation among learned Men. Now this is a copious Argument, and a great deal may be ſaid of it; but to ſave the Readers Pains and my own, and not to tranſcribe more than is neceſſary, any Man may be ſatisfied what Opinion the learned World hath always had of them by thoſe excellent Characters given of them, publiſhed and annexed to their reſpective Writings, and more particularly in *Voſſius de Hiſtoricis Græcis & Latinis*, where the Reader may find ſuch Encomiums of their Diligence, Skill, and Fidelity, as will not eaſily be match'd by the Characters given by learned Men of any other Hiſtorians. One of them (*Diodorus*) tells us, he ſpent thirty Years in compiling his Hiſtory. And *Voſſius* remarks of him, that he was ſo great a lover of Truth, that he travelled into *Aſia* and *Europe*, and was diſcouraged by no Trouble and Dangers from perſonally viſiting thoſe Places concerning which he was about to write. Another of them (*Plutarch*) was of that Repute, that he was no inconſiderable Man who ſaid, That if all the Books in the World were to be burnt but one, his was that one that ſhould be ſaved. And (to ſay no more) theſe Writers are the moſt eminent Perſons that have eſcaped the great Shipwrack of Learning, and to whom we owe more of the Knowledge

In Prof.

De Hiſt. Gr. p. 167.

Theodorus Gaza.

we

we have, here in the Weſt, of antient times, than to all the Authors in the World, excepting the Penmen of the holy Books: And their Reputation, as Hiſtorians, hath always been not onely ſo clear, but ſo great and auguſt, that a Man would wonder what ſhould make our Author treat them ſo courſly, and give ſuch a ſcandalous Account of them, as if they were acted by irregular and undue Paſſions, and in the writing their Hiſtories were directed by *Hatred* and *Malice*, and not according to the trueſt ſtate of things they were able to come to the knowledge of. Such things as theſe, one would think, eſpecially from a Man that pretends to *vindicate* an *Hiſtorian*, ſhould not onely have been barely *ſuggeſted*, but *proved*, at leaſt offered to be *proved*; for a Man that writes Paradoxes, againſt the Senſe and Judgment of all the World, is bound in Juſtice to himſelf to give ſome Reaſon for it, if he have any to give; and I dare be bold to ſay, that no Man, beſides our Author, ever charged theſe Hiſtorians with ſuch a ſcandalous Imputation; but on the contrary ſpeak of them not only with all imaginable Candour, but Veneration alſo, with reſpect to their Character of Hiſtorians.

2. The particular Advantages theſe Hiſtorians had of informing themſelves of the true Account of the Expedition of *Alexander*: And that was an opportunity of conſulting thoſe Authors who were followers of *Alexander*, and Eye-Witneſſes of his Actions; and thoſe we have an account of are *Ariſtobulus*, *Clitarchus*, *Oneſicritus*, and *Ptolomæus Lagi*; which laſt was one of *Alexander*'s great Captains, and after his Death King of *Egypt*. Theſe were perſonally acquainted with the Story of *Alexander*, and had conſign'd it to Writing, whoſe Writings theſe Hiſtorians conſulted, and from whom reſpectively they extracted their Hiſtories. *Diodorus* mentions *Clitarchus*; *Plutarch* very often *Ariſtobulus*, and all the reſt; *Curtius* mentions *Clitarchus* and *Ptolomy*; and *Arrian* plainly tells us, that he made uſe of, and collected his Hiſtory from *Ariſtobulus* and *Ptolomy*, and that *what they had written of* Alexander *he would write alſo, as being moſt true*; and adds a weighty Reaſon, why the Truth of *Ptolomy*'s Relation ought not to be called in queſtion; for that he was not onely a Soldier under *Alexander*, but when he wrote theſe things he was a *King*, in whom an untruth would be more foul than in any other Perſon. Theſe then were the Authors our *Hiſtorians* conſulted, and they compiled their reſpective Hiſtories out of the Writings of thoſe very Men, who were *Eye-Witneſſes* to what they delivered, and were all of them *Companions* to *Alexander* in his Expedition, and one of them in a moſt eminent Station and Place of Truſt under him. And now I will appeal to all the World, and to the Author himſelf, if ſuch a joint Omiſſion of a *ſingle* Story, vouched but by a *ſingle* Author, be not ſufficient to make

Diod. lib. 11. *Plut. in Alexandro. Curt. l.* 9. *Arrian. Præf.*

Ὅτα μὲν ταῦτα ἄμφω περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρε τῦ Φιλίππε ξυνέγραψεν, ταῦτα ἐγὼ ὡς πάντη ἀληθῆ ἀναγράφω.

that *Story ſuſpitious*; for otherwiſe one of theſe three things muſt follow: Either that *Joſephus*, who wrote 400 Years after, knew better what was done than thoſe that were *Eye-Witneſſes*; or, that ſeveral *Eye-Witneſſes* undertaking to write a Story, ſhould all of them, either wilfully and induſtriouſly, or through negligence or inadvertence, omit the moſt obſervable Paſſage in the whole; or, that other Hiſtorians of undoubted Credit, and living in ſeveral Ages, and in divers Nations, and being of differing Tempers and Intereſts, and each of them conſulting and tranſcribing out of the Writings of thoſe *Eye-Witneſſes*, ſhould all of them unanimouſly omit one ſingle Story, of very great Note, and which had been particularly remarked by the Authors they conſulted; and this without the leaſt Proof that either of them actually did ſo, and which is founded onely on an inevident and preſumptive Malice, which they had in their Hearts. How willing ſoever ſome Men are to impoſe upon themſelves, I defie the moſt credulous and eaſie Man alive to believe either of theſe, if he can. Men had need complain of *Faction* and *Party*, that offer ſuch things as theſe for Reaſons.

He adds, *It was the ſame Reaſon that they had to paſs by all the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; ſhould we therefore grant the Story of theſe to be ſuſpitious, becauſe the Heathen Writers of thoſe times take no Notice of any ſuch thing?* But how does the Author know, that the Heathen Writers of thoſe times did paſs by the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles out of *Malice* to them and to the Chriſtian Religion? Might it not be done out of Miſtake, want of due Information, Incredulity, or becauſe it was foreign to the Matter of their Hiſtory? Some of theſe I ſuppoſe may paſs for as good Reaſons as *Malice*. But let that be as it will, it is nothing at all to the purpoſe; for the Caſes are by no means parallel upon many accounts: For, 1. The Reaſon and Ground of my Objection was not the mere Silence of theſe Hiſtorians, but their Silence in ſuch Matters as not onely relate to, but make a mighty Figure in the Hiſtory they treat of; and in ſuch Caſes their Omiſſion is an Argument of Suſpition, though their bare Omiſſion be not: And therefore to make our *Author*'s Anſwer reach the Caſe, we muſt ſuppoſe, that the Life of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* was the immediate ſubject of their reſpective Hiſtories, as the Life of *Alexander* was of theſe *Hiſtorians*; and then indeed their omitting the Miracles, and moſt remarkable Inſtances of their Lives, would have made the Caſes of Omiſſion parallel; but this is a little too wild for any Man to ſuppoſe. And what a pure Conſequence is this! The Omiſſion of the moſt memorable Paſſage in the Life of *Alexander*, by thoſe *Hiſtorians* who wrote the Life of *Alexander*, is an Argument that that Story is ſuſpitious; and therefore the Omiſſion of the Miracles of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, by thoſe Hiſtorians who do not write their Lives, is likewiſe an Argument of the ſame Suſpition. But if this, as inconſequent as it is, was allowed our Authour, it would not ſerve his Purpoſe: For,

2. There

2. There is a great Difference in the Authority: 'Tis true, the Heathen Writers taking no Notice of the Miracles of *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, is no reason to grant, that therefore they are suspitious; nor yet would it be any reason, if they had expressed the clean contrary: But the reason of that is, because they have the Testimony of Writings divinely inspired, and the Authority of which cannot be impeach'd by the Assertions, and much less by the Silence of all the Heathens in the World. But what is this to the Authority of *Josephus?* Does that stand upon as clear a bottom as the Scriptures? And where I wonder is the consequence, because the Silence of Heathen Writers is nothing against the Authority of the *Holy Ghost*, therefore it is also nothing against the Authority of *Josephus?* And therefore this is nothing to the purpose, except the Authority of *Josephus* was as sacred and infallible as the Scriptures themselves. And therefore if our Author would make the Cases parallel, he must suppose that the Miracles of *Christ* and his *Apostles* stood onely upon humane Testimony, and then suppose five Heathen Historians, of undoubted Credit, should professedly undertake to write the *Life* and *Acts* of our Saviour and his Apostles, and one single Christian, of no better Credit than they in point of History, should take notice of one single Instance omitted by them all; I would fain know, whether in such a Case that single Instance might not reasonably be deemed suspitious, and of doubtfull Credit. But yet this is not the Case: For,

3. The Character of the Historians, even in point of Religion, very well suits with the Matter of their History. Here we have *five Heathen* Historians writing the Life of a *Heathen* Prince; and therefore there can be no Exception taken to their Religion in that point: And if this was an Argument, 'tis against the Authority of *Josephus*; for I suppose the *Heathens* hated the *Jews* no more than the *Jews* did the *Heathens*; and I hope the Authority of a *Heathen Historian* may be argumentative with respect to the History of a *Heathen* Prince, though it be not the same with respect to the History of Christ and his Apostles. For what if they did bear Malice to the Jews, and to the Christians, Did they bear Malice to *Alexander* also, that they would not tell the truth which they knew of him? Our Author indeed tells us, that *it made for the Honour of the Jewish Nation*; and what if it did? Did it not make for the Honour of *Alexander* also? And therefore those who write the Story of *Alexander*, would not relate an *honourable* and memorable Passage concerning him, because that would redound also to the Honour of the *Jews*; that is to say, they would all of them doe wrong to Truth, to the Prince they wrote of, and to their own History, rather than doe right to an Enemy. However the Question is concerning the History of an *Heathen Prince*, recorded by *Heathen Historians*, and I hope there is a great deal of Difference between Heathen Historians omitting Matters relating to a Heathen Prince; and between Heathen Historians

ans omitting Matters relating to our Saviour, and his Religion; for who expects an account of Chriſtianity from *Heathen* Writers? And 'tis a pure Conſequence, becauſe they have not recorded an extraordinary Inſtance in the Life of a *Heathen*, and becauſe likewiſe the *Heathen Hiſtorians* have not recorded the Miracles of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; therefore their Omiſſion in one Caſe may be drawn into Argument, as well as the other: For
P. 3. our *Author* tells us very gravely, *We ought to take heed of ſuch Arguments as an Adverſary may make uſe of againſt the Goſpel it ſelf.* And what I pray is this dangerous Argument? Why truly 'tis as plain as can be; Becauſe one ſingle Story in the Life of a *Heathen* Prince is ſuſpitious, as being recorded onely by *Joſephus*, for that ſeveral *Heathen* Hiſtorians, of as good Credit as himſelf, who have given us the whole Progreſs of that Prince, have not in the leaſt mentioned it; therefore if this be admitted the Goſpel is in danger: For an Adverſary may ſay, that the *Heathen Hiſtorians* of thoſe times took no notice of the Miracles of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles; and therefore if their Silence be an Argument of Suſpition, 'tis equally ſo in both Caſes, becauſe thoſe *Heathen Hiſtorians* neither undertook to write the Life of Chriſt, nor of his Apoſtles; nor, if they had, were they of equal Credit with them that did; nor is humane Teſtimony to ſtand in competition with divine Teſtimony. And now let any *Heathen*, *Turk*, or *Jew*, Friend or Foe, provided he be a rational Creature, make ſuch an Argument, if he can; which notwithſtanding is the true ſtate of the Caſe. And by the way, if our Author had no more to ſay to prove the Authority of the Scriptures, than he has for the Authority of this Story of *Joſephus*, he would make the Scriptures themſelves as ſuſpitious as this Story: and he may conſider his own Caution; for as we ought to take heed of ſuch *Arguments*, ſo we ought to take heed of ſuch *Parallels* as an Adverſary may make uſe of againſt the Goſpel it ſelf. For as our Author hath handled the Matter, he makes the Authority of *Joſephus* equal with the Scriptures; for if the Silence of *Heathen* Hiſtorians be no Argument againſt *Joſephus*, becauſe it is no Argument againſt the Scriptures, I doubt he muſt make both of the ſame Authority, or elſe own that his Anſwer is nothing to the purpoſe.

But after all, our *Author* is not ſo apprehenſive of what an Adverſary in this Caſe may make uſe of againſt the Goſpel; for he tells us immediately following, *But if it were true that our Objector here ſays, that theſe Heathens tell us the clean contrary to that which we have from* Joſephus, *there might be ſomething in this Contradiction, though not in the Silence of Heathen Writers.* Very well! Then ſuppoſe the Heathen Writers, as *Porphirie* and *Celſus* for Inſtance, ſhould expreſly ſay, that *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did no Miracles, according to our Author's way of anſwering there might be *ſomething* in that, though nothing at all in their *Silence*, and then I doubt if an Adverſary had the handling of it, he would go near to make a much ſtronger Argument againſt the Goſpel upon our Author's Principles, than if he argued

gued from their meer Silence: But our Author's Buſineſs was to anſwer me, and that is enough at one time, and not to conſider the conſequences of his own Anſwers, which more palpably run him into thoſe very Inconveniences he is willing to charge me with; for if he will ſtick by his Anſwer, it inevitably turns upon him, and he will never be able to avoid it: Well! but *there might be ſomething in this Contradiction, though not in the Silence of Heathen Writers*; But then what becomes of our Author's Reaſon before for their *Silence*; *viz.* their *Hatred* and *Contempt* of the *Jews?* For if that be a Reaſon for their *Silence* of this Story, why is it not alſo as good a Reaſon for their *Contradicting* it? And if *Malice* prompted them to omit a Paſſage that made for the honour of the *Jewiſh* Nation, the ſame *Malice*, I ſuppoſe, might as well prompt them to ſay *the clean contrary*: For if Hiſtorians write by their Paſſions, and not according to plain Truth, that Character equally extends to what they ſay, as to what they do not, provided there be but the ſame Reaſon, that is, *Malice* to the Perſons about whom they write. So that had our Author ſo pleaſed, this might have been as good a Reaſon againſt their *Contradicting* this Story, as their *Silence* in it; and he might with the ſame Truth and Juſtice have charged them with *malitious Inventing*, as well as with *malitious Omitting*. But the Author I ſuppoſe did not think it neceſſary for his purpoſe now, he thought they did not contradict this Story, and therefore (though his Reaſon be the ſame againſt both) is contented to *allow that there may be ſomething in this Contradiction.* Well; let us take what he will allow us, and I believe he had better have kept to his Reaſon, and have charged them with *Malice* in all Points, and there had been an end, and there is no Credit to be given to what they ſay; and this, though no body could have believed it, it would have ſerved however for an Anſwer: For if our Author will admit their *contradicting* this Story to be *ſomething*, I doubt they have ſaid that which is very near contradicting it; and our Author muſt have an extraordinary Faculty, if he can reconcile this *Story* to what they deliver, as we ſhall ſee upon examining what our Author ſays. He adds, *Perhaps the Objector might mean, that the account of thoſe Hiſtorians is contrary to that of the Author, againſt whom he writes; for this Author, as he cites him, (I know not how truly,) ſaith, that from* Tyre Alexander *came directly to* Jeruſalem. *That indeed doth not agree with the account given us by the Hiſtorians he mentions: But* Joſephus *doth not ſay this; he tells us that* Alexander *having beſieged* Tyre *ſeven Months, and then taken it, came forward to* Gaza, *and took it after a Siege of two Months, and then haſted to* Jeruſalem, *which ſubmitted to him, as alſo did the neighbouring Cities.* Now our Author ſeems to inſinuate to his Readers, that my Anſwer to the Objection was this: That whereas it is in the Objection, that *Alexander* from *Tyre* came directly to *Jeruſalem*, I aſſert from the Hiſtorians, that he came from *Tyre* directly to *Gaza*, and not to *Jeruſalem*; but this is neither my Anſwer, nor can be made out from my Words. I cited the Objection indeed,

as

as I found it, (whether our Author thinks I cited it truly or no,) and he that made the Objection put it in that manner; but I knew well enough *Josephus* did not say, that *Alexander* came directly from *Tyre* to *Jerusalem*; and therefore I took no advantage of that Mistake, but suited my Answer to the Objection in the full latitude, and as it ought to have been; and accordingly I say that these Historians tell us, "That from the Siege of *Tyre* Answ. p. 6. "*Alexander* went directly to *Gaza*, and so on into *Egypt*. Now *Alexander*'s going directly from *Gaza* to *Egypt*, as much contradicts the true Objection, and the account of *Josephus*, as his going directly from *Tyre* to *Gaza* does the Mistake of the Objector. *But*, saith our Author, *this consists very well with what we read in those Historians; for they agree, that from* Tyre *he went directly to* Gaza; *yet after the taking that City, they do not say that he went presently into* Ægypt. *He might stay long enough to go to* Jerusalem, *which was about fifty Miles distant, and receive the Submission of that, and the neighbouring Cities, before he went into* Ægypt. Now I do not know what our Author means, when he says these Historians do not say that *Alexander* went *presently* into *Egypt*. They say he went from *Gaza*, and after the Siege of *Gaza* into *Egypt*; and that, I think, is not saying, that from *Gaza*, or after the Siege of *Gaza*, he went to *Jerusalem*, but the contrary; as if a Man describing the Journies of a Traveller should say, he came to *Uxbridge*, and from thence he went to *London*, and then he went to *Canterbury*: I would fain ask any Body, whether this is not a contradiction to the saying that Traveller went from *London* to *St. Albans*, and thence to *Canterbury*, except the Man had some *Spight* to *St. Albans*, and then indeed I do not know how much it might alter the Business? The Situation is just the same; for *Jerusalem* stands North of *Gaza*, and *Egypt* is South: and a Man would be apt to imagine, that the saying *Alexander* went *South*, is a contradiction to the saying he went *North*; for as I take it, two opposite Points of the Compass are contrary to each other. And as to *Alexander*'s doing this *presently*, or as our Author says, they do not say he *presently* went into *Egypt*, *Curtius* tells us, *that he made haste into* Egypt; and that *on the seventh day after he had moved his Army from* Gaza, *he came into the Region of* Egypt. Now I doubt this does directly contradict the account of *Josephus*, and which our Author defends: For if *Alexander* on the seventh day after his Removal from *Gaza* arrived in *Egypt*, I wonder how it was possible for him to go with his whole Army fifty Miles another way, (for our Author tells us, *Jerusalem* was about fifty Miles from *Gaza*,) and to receive the Submission of *Jerusalem*, and stay there a day at least, and then pursue his Voyage into *Egypt*, and accomplish all this in seven days. I wonder what kind of Marches our Author, to make this out, must allot for great Armies? Archbishop *Usher* (to whose Judgment our P. 9. Author tells us he attributes much in these Matters,) was sensible of this Incon-

Ægyptum adire festinans,---- ille septimo die postea quam a Gaza Copias movérat, in Regionem Ægypti pervenit. Curt. *l.* 4. Arrian. *in init. l.* 3.

Inconvenience; and therefore though he hath taken the main Story from *Josephus*, yet he was not so very fond of his Credit, as to defend Impossibilities to justifie it; but plainly tells us from these Historians, that *Alexander* went directly from *Gaza* into *Egypt*, and came on the *seventh day* to *Pelusium*, and *not*, *by turning his Journey backwards*, *to* Jerusalem, *after the taking of* Gaza, *as it is* inconsiderately *delivered by* Josephus. Now it is plain, Bp. *Usher* thought the account of these Historians contradicted the account of *Josephus* in this matter; it is plain likewise, that for that Reason he rejected the Authority of *Josephus*, so far as it relates to this particular; for he expressly quotes *Curtius* and *Arrian*, and charges *Josephus* with *Inconsiderateness*, for affirming contrary to what they do: And this is as good an Argument against the whole Story, as it is against this particular Branch of it; for if it be an Argument against *Josephus*'s account of *Alexander*'s coming from *Gaza* to *Jerusalem*, because these Historians say that on the seventh day upon his moving from *Gaza*, he came into *Egypt*; and this is irreconcilable with what *Josephus* delivers. Then 'tis likewise an argument against his coming from *Tyre* to *Jerusalem*, (which is the Bp's account;) for they as expressly affirm that *Alexander* went directly from *Tyre* to *Gaza*, as that he went from *Gaza* to *Egypt* in seven days; and which our Author also owns. So that if the Reason be good, *Alexander* came not from *Gaza* to *Jerusalem*, as in *Josephus*'s account, nor from *Tyre* to *Jerusalem*, as in the Bishop's account; and consequently he did not come there at all: So that although the Primate allows the Story, yet the reason why he rejects this part, is equally valid against the whole; and that is, as it contradicts the account given us by those Historians who wrote the Life of *Alexander*; and *Josephus* upon the same Reason might be charged with *Rashness* and *Inconsiderateness*, with respect to the whole, as well as with respect to a particular part of it; and his Authority against them is no better in one case, than it is in the other. And this I thought good to say with respect to Bp. *Usher*'s account of this Matter, and I did it for these Reasons:

Anno Mundi 1673. ---*non retro converso itinere, Hierosolymam (uti minus considerate à Josepho est traditum) Gaza expugnata petiit.*---

1. To shew our *Author*, that notwithstanding his pretence of *attributing very much to his Judgment in these Matters*, he takes the liberty to differ from him, as often as he pleases, and as often as he thinks it for his purpose.

2. To shew him that Bp. *Usher* made no scruple of charging *Josephus* with *Inconsiderateness*, when he thought there was good Reason for it; and therefore there was no such need of an Out-cry against his Adversary's *eager desire to find Faults in* Josephus, *and which blinded his Eyes.* P. 5.

3. To shew our *Author* the ingenuity of his insinuating Parenthesis, p. 3. when he says concerning the Objection I put, with respect to this Story, that *Alexander* from *Tyre* came directly to *Jerusalem*; and then tells me, This Author, as he cites him, *(I know not how truly;)* Now (as it happens) the Objection is the very sense of Bp. *Usher*, (though I had no immediate

reſpect to him, but to another Objector,) and any Man who reads our Author's Vindication, will eaſily conclude that he is well acquainted with the Biſhop's ſenſe; and when that is the ſame with the Objection, by a ſly Parentheſis to queſtion whether I had cited it *truly*, or no, as if no Man had made it, is ſuch a ſtrain of Ingenuity, that is not eaſily to be met with, and may ſerve for a Parallel to ſuch honeſt Hiſtorians as our Author talks of, who can omit plain Matter of Fact, out of pure *Malice* and *Contempt* to the Perſons concerned.

4 To ſhew our Author the great Difference that is between Archbiſhop *Uſher* and him. The Archbiſhop indeed was a very learned Man, and, as
P. 7. our Author ſays, *a great Chronologer, and a good Textuary*; and agreeable to that Character we do not find him loading thoſe Hiſtorians with Reproaches and Calumnies, and charging them with Hatred and Malice, when there is nothing elſe to ſay, which is a way of anſwering peculiar to our Author, and not much in uſe among learned Men. But inſtead of that the A. Bp. owns them as Authors of good Credit and Authority, and to ſay no more, in *Alexander*'s Progreſs prefers them to *Joſephus*; and where they contradict the account of *Joſephus*, he owns theirs, and rejects *Joſephus*'s, as in the preſent Inſtance; and I doubt not but he would have rejected the whole Story, had he as well conſidered it; for the Reaſon is the ſame in both: But this Controverſie was never on foot before, and learned Men might eaſily let a Story paſs, which they had no great occaſion to conſider.

5. That it was the A. Bp's Judgment, (and, as our Author tells me,
P. 20. with reſpect to the Convocation, he may be *aware how much the Archbiſhop's Judgment would be preferred before his, where he differs from him*,) that the Story, as *Joſephus* hath laid it, contradicts the account of theſe Hiſtorians, and that the A. Bp. could not reconcile them; and therefore in that particular rejected the Authority of *Joſephus*. But however our Author makes it as eaſie as poſſible; for he tells us, *That* Alexander *might well doe this*, (go from *Gaza* to *Jeruſalem*,) *according to* Diodor's *account, who ſaith, that* having ſettled things about *Gaza*, *he ſent away* Amyntas *into* Macedonia. A very pleaſant account! *Diodor* ſaith *Alexander ſettled* or diſpoſed Things about *Gaza*; that is, according to our Author's Interpretation, he went and took in *Jeruſalem*, and the whole Kingdom of *Judea*: Juſt as if a Man ſhould ſay, the King of *England* ſettled Things about *Newcaſtle*; that is to ſay, he went and conquered *Edinburgh*, and all the Kingdom of *Scotland*. At this rate our Author may make Hiſtorians agree with him when he pleaſe, and they muſt be very *malitious Heathens* indeed, if he cannot bring them over to ſerve his purpoſe. And yet after ſuch Proofs as theſe our Author gravely concludes, *This being not contrary, but very conſiſtent with the account we have from* Joſephus, *there is no farther cauſe of* Suſpition *on this Head.*

Τὰ περὶ τὴν Γάζαν διοικήσας.

The next thing which our Authour examines, is the *Difficulty of reconciling it to Chronology*. Nay, (our Author adds,) *This is not all the Objector*

jecter tells us, for he ſaith afterwards, there are Difficulties that have perplexed all Chronologers; and at laſt there are inſuperable Difficulties in this Story. Now all this I ſaid, but not in the ſame manner and order, nor with the ſame reſpect as our Author mentions them, as we ſhall ſee preſently: and it is well for our Author that he writes in defence of Dr. *Sherlock*, and not againſt him, for otherwiſe he might have been chaſtiſed for this, and have been told, that the *altering his* Adverſaries *Method and Order, had more of art than honeſty in it.* But I ſhall leave ſuch Exceptions as theſe to Dr. *Sherlock*, only I think if he did not like the order I propoſed them in, he ought at leaſt fairly to have repreſented them, and to have expreſſed the full force of them; if he would have done this, he might have taken what method he liked beſt: but to break the Series and Thread of a Diſcourſe, and leave out five parts in ſix, that immediately concerns the Argument; to pick out one Sentence from a Paragraph, and leave out all the reſt; to take a piece from one place, and tack it to another to which it does not belong, and to apply a ſmall part of a Sentence to another part of it, though it reſpects the whole, and then argue from it, and ſuch like: Now ſuch fine things as theſe could never have been done, if our Author would have anſwered in order, and Paragraph by Paragraph, or at leaſt have taken the Paragraph entire when he did anſwer it; or, if that might not be, to have taken the entire Argument, or at leaſt the ſenſe of it: But inſtead of that our Author is for taking a piece here, and a piece there; a Word from one place, and a Sentence from another; and this he calls anſwering, as we ſhall ſee as we go along; for I ſhall punctually follow him, and examine all that he ſays, in my *Reply*, though with reſpect to my Objections, he was not pleaſed to doe either in his *Anſwer*.

Vindic. of the Caſe of Alleg p. 1.

And with reſpect to the *Difficulties* that attend this Story in point of *Chronology*, firſt of all our Author asks, *Where are they; for I confeſs I do not ſee any Difficulty?* Now had Dr. *Sherlock* been to anſwer, he would have told him, *They are in my Book ſtill, and there he may find them:* And I muſt needs *confeſs*, this is quick and expeditious, and if *Difficulties* will be anſwered by asking where they are, we may expect full Performance. But ſuppoſe our Author cannot ſee Wood for Trees; he cannot ſee the *Difficulties*, becauſe ſo thick and obvious; he cannot ſee them becauſe he can ſee nothing elſe. The Chronology of the *Jewiſh* affairs, that are contemporary with the *Perſian* Monarchy, is a difficult piece of Chronology, as any other whatever, and hath been matter of Diſpute and Contention among all Chronologers; and one main Reaſon of that is, The lame and imperfect (not to ſay falſe) account that *Joſephus* hath given of the affairs of *Judea*, with reſpect to that time; and this very Story (whether our Author can ſee it or no) hath been one ground of theſe Contentions: However the *Difficulties* may be what they will, for any thing our Author ſays to remove or reconcile them. He hath given another account indeed of ſome things than I have done;

P. 4.

and

and who could doubt of that? Other Men have given another account than he has done; and as many Men as have undertaken it, there are so many Minds about it; our Author's own account in some respects differs from all the World besides, as we shall see by and by; but this makes nothing against my Objection, but for it; for I plainly suppose it, and my Argument turns upon it, and the consequence is, that therefore it is *difficult*. The various account that is given proves the Uncertainty, and if the Author's account differs from others as good Chronologers as himself, this still farther confirms it, whether our Author can see any Difficulty or no. The force of this will appear as we proceed.

The Author says I tell him the Difficulty *lies in the Ages of the Persons, mighty Ages, not in the least mentioned by any Historian, as that* Sanballat *lived to above* 145, *and* Jaddus *to above* 124 *Years of age.*

He answers, *But doth* Josephus *say this? Not in words, nothing like it.* Right, nor in sense neither; and so I had said, as plain as I could speak,—

Answ. p. 9. "That neither *Josephus* himself, nor any other Historian, takes the least "notice of either of them living to such mighty ages;— and our Author repeats it, *not in the least mentioned by any Historian.* And this is plainly the reason of my Objection, That because neither *Josephus*, nor any Historian had taken notice of their living to such ages, therefore there was no reason to conclude they lived so long; and this I had confirmed from Experience and common Observation, that such Instances are as famous as Prodigies, and as much taken notice of by Historians, as in the Case of old *Parr*. And what then doth our Author mean by his Question, *Does* Josephus *say this, or any thing like it?* For if he had said it, there would have been no force in that part of the Objection, and it is founded in his not saying it: But this is the effect of Jumbling and Confusion, and of taking pieces of Sentences, without considering the whole Argument: Men speak for their Adversaries when they think they speak against them. And our *Author* instead of answering hath confirmed and proved my Objection; and he gives that very thing in answer, which in so many words I had given as the Ground of my Objection. *But* (says he) *it must come to this, if the Objector reckons true.* Come to what? *That* Josephus *says* Sanballat *lived to above* 145 *Years*, &c. Nothing like it: It must come to this indeed, that *Josephus* is mistaken in his Calculation of the Time wherein *Sanballat* and *Jaddus* lived: But this is nothing at all to his *saying* they lived so long; for that he does not say; and yet assigning them to such times, when by Chronological Computation they must have lived to such ages, and in the mean time taking no notice that they actually did live to such remarkable ages, is a sign that he hath misplaced them, and is out as to the time of their Living, though he might not be so in their respective ages, which he takes no notice of. He adds, *and if he misreckon for* Josephus, *he deals as ill with Scripture, oncly he doth not charge it with Suspition on that account.* This is a very

very ſad buſineſs indeed; that is to ſay, I do not think the Scripture account is *ſuſpitious*, though I think *Joſephus*'s account is; and where is the harm of that? and where, I wonder is the *ill dealing with Scripture?* why 'tis as plain as can be; for he adds, *But according to the Scripture, as he underſtands it*, Ezra *muſt have lived to a much greater age than either of thoſe before mentioned.* But now for the Validity of our Author's Anſwer; *Did I ſay this? Not in words; nothing like it.* No matter for that; our Author hath ſomething elſe to doe, than to mind whether his own Anſwers anſwer himſelf: However he tells us, That

The Objector will have Ezra *born about ſix years before the* Babylonian *Captivity, and to have ſeen the firſt Temple ſtanding, and fifty nine years after this, viz. in the firſt year of* Cyrus, *to have returned from the Captivity; ſo that then* Ezra *was 65 years of age by his Reckoning: From thence to the ſeventh of* Artaxerxes Longimanus, *are 79 years; ſo that then* Ezra *muſt have been 144 years of age; and yet it is certain, that in that year* Ezra *made a Journey from* Babylon *to* Jeruſalem; *and as certain that he lived 13 years after that, till the 20th of* Artaxerxes; *and then he muſt have been 157 years of age; and yet as old as he was, that very year he led the Proceſſion up and down Stairs, about the Wall of* Jeruſalem: *He might live many years after this, as we may judge by his ſtrength of Body in that Exerciſe; but if he dyed that year, being 159 years old, as he muſt be by the Objector's Reckoning,* —— And after having proved his point by theſe Chronological Steps, he thus concludes: *He that finds no Difficulty in this, or takes no notice of it, for fear of reflecting upon Scripture, ought not to call that Story in* Joſephus *ſuſpitious, becauſe of the* Difficulty of reconciling it with *Chronology.* And why ſo, I pray? Is the Authority of *Joſephus* as ſacred as the *Scriptures?* and is there the ſame reaſon to charge the Scripture account with Suſpicion, becauſe of ſome Chronological Difficulties, as there is a *Story* in *Joſephus?* And here I muſt once again congratulate our *Author*, that he did not write againſt Dr. *Sherlock*, for then he might have been told, *Whither theſe Arguments will carry our Author I cannot tell. I grant indeed*, that a Story in *Joſephus* is ſuſpitious, becauſe it is clogg'd with Difficulties; *but is that a Reaſon to reject the* Authority *of Scripture too? This hath nothing but either Scepticiſm or Infallibility at the bottom.* And this though it was nothing againſt his Anſwerer, I am afraid it will reach home here; for if to argue from the *Difficulties* that are in the Scriptures, to the *Suſpicion* of the Truth of what they deliver in thoſe Matters, be as reaſonable as to argue in the ſame manner with reſpect to humane Writings, then I doubt it will follow, (as the Doctor ſays,) *that we muſt be either Scepticks in Religion, or ſeek for an infallible Interpreter*: If it be not as reaſonable, then our Author's Concluſion is nothing to the Purpoſe, and his Premiſſes and Concluſion do not agree. His Premiſſes are, that according to the Objector's account of Scripture, *Ezra* muſt have lived to 157 years; and this is a Difficulty in Chronology: And thence concludes, that *I ought not to call*

Anſw. p. 17.

Ezra 7.

Neh. 12. 36, 37.

Vindicat. p. 48, 49.

that Story in Josephus *suspitious, because of the Difficulty of reconciling it with Chronology*, as if the Difficulty of reconciling a Story with Chronology, was as good an Argument against the Authority of Scripture, as it is against
P. 5. the Authority of *Josephus*. Our Author tells me, that *an eager desire to find Faults in* Josephus *blinded my Eyes:* Now Passion, Interest, and the God of this World is very apt to doe so, and if our Author please to consider, whether an eager Desire to *vindicate* him, hath not had that very effect upon him.

P. 5. Our Authour adds, *In vain do Men talk of reconciling Differences,* (I suppose it should be Difficulties,) *where there are none, but of their own making. They that take* Ezra *to have been born before the Captivity, judge so for this Reason.* Now here are two things of pleasant Observation.

1. But just before our Author tells me, that *I find no Difficulty in the Age of* Ezra, and objects it to me, and argues upon it, and yet now it must be, *in vain do Men talk of* Difficulties, though all the *Difficulties* he speaks of here are such only as respect the age of *Ezra*.

2. He intimates, that these Difficulties are onely of my *own making*; and yet it immediately follows, They *that take* Ezra *to have been born*, &c. then it seems it is *They*, and not my self onely, that have made it, or found it, which our Author please. And what can a Man say to such an Answerer, that forgets himself at this rate, and twice together contradicts in the Line following what he had said but the very Line before.

Well; but *They that take* Ezra *to have been born before the Captivity, judge so*
Ezra 7. 1. *for this Reason, because it is said, that he was the Son of* Seraia *the high Priest, that was killed before the Captivity: But in like manner* Seraiah *is there made the 17th from* Aaron, *that lived near a thousand years before. The meaning is, that* Seraia *was descended from* Aaron *(and so* Ezra *was from* Seraia*) not immediately, but with others between, that are not mentioned. And so* Johanan
Neh. 12. 23. *the High Priest is called the Son of* Eliashib, *who indeed was his Grandfather,*
12. 10. *and his Father was* Jehoiada, *that is not there mentioned. This is a common way of shortening Pedigrees, which if the Objector had considered, he would not have run himself into that Difficulty of* Ezra's *Age, which though he takes no notice of, is much greater than those of which he complains.* In answer to this I have these things to observe:

1. That our Author's Solution of this Difficulty is not very probable: For though it be admitted, that Pedigrees in Scripture are often shortened; and according to the way of Expression among the *Hebrews*, when one is said to be the Son of another, it does not always mean, that that Person was his immediate Father, but that he was descended from him, though not immediately. But this notwithstanding, here are two things that make a great difference in the present Case, and which are reasons that it is not so to be understood, when it is said that *Ezra* was the Son of *Seraia*.

(1.) That

(1.) That *Ezra* himſelf was the Perſon who related this Pedigree, and it is not very probable that he ſhould omit and make no mention of his own immediate Father; and I believe there is not one ſingle Inſtance to be found, in the deſcribing any Genealogy in Scripture, that the immediate Father of the Perſon whoſe Genealogy was deſcribed was left out, though at the ſame time ſome others of the direct Line, but of remoter diſtance, have been omitted; and this is yet more, when the Perſon writes his own Genealogy: And therefore the Inſtance the Author mentions is not parallel, that *Johanan* is called the Son of *Eliaſhib*, who was his Grandfather; for there it is onely barely mentioned, as denoting the Man. But the Genealogy of *Johanan* is not there recited, and much leſs recited by himſelf. *Ezra* 7. 1. *Neh.* 12. 23.

(2.) Where there are ſuch Omiſſions, they are prov'd to be ſo from other places of Scripture; but when there are no ſuch Proofs, they are preſumed to be the immediate Sons of the Perſons whoſe Sons they are named to be; In the Author's Inſtance *Johanan* is called the Son of *Eliaſhib*, and he would have been ſo reputed, had it not appeared in other places that *Jehoiada* was his Father, and not *Eliaſhib*. But who was the Father of *Ezra*, if *Seraia* was not? He is ſaid to be ſo, and it does not appear that any other Perſon was; and it is purely arbitrary to ſay he was not, without any other proof but the *Commonneſs of ſhortening Pedigrees*: For as common as that was, a great many, nay moſt were immediately deſcended from thoſe Perſons who are ſaid to be their Fathers. And it is not reaſonable to make this Exception general, and to affirm it of any Perſon of our own Heads, and where there is nothing in Scripture to make it appear. But,

2. Suppoſe all thi; and what then? Why then I am miſtaken in the time that I have aſſigned to the Birth of *Ezra*, and that (as I underſtand it) is a Difficulty in Chronology greater than thoſe I complain of, and I take no notice of it. Suppoſe I am miſtaken in the time of *Ezra*'s living, does it follow therefore that *Joſephus* is not miſtaken as to the Times of *Jaddus*? That Conſequence I ſuppoſe lies a great way off, and that is the main Controverſie.

3. Suppoſe again that I am miſtaken, as to the time of *Ezra*'s Birth; what is that to the Argument upon the account of which I mentioned it? which was to prove, that the building the ſecond Temple was in the time of *Darius Hyſtaſpis*, not of *Darius Nothus*; the force of which does not ſtand purely upon the time of *Ezra*'s Birth, but of thoſe who ſaw the firſt Temple in its Glory, and were living at the Building of the ſecond Temple, and lamented at the great Difference that was between them: and whoſoever will anſwer that, muſt not onely prove that *Ezra* was not the immediate Son of *Seraia*, according to the manner of ſhortening Genealogies, but muſt prove alſo, that none of thoſe who ſaw the firſt Temple, were alive at the Building the ſecond. But our Author does not meddle with that, nor at all concern himſelf with the reaſon for which it was uſed, and for Anſw. p. 7, 8. *Ezra* 3. 12. *Hag.* 2. 3.

which

which it was urged, not ſingly as a Proof by it ſelf, but jointly with other Inſtances, and which the other Inſtances without this are a ſufficient Proof of. But our Author is for picking out a ſingle Inſtance from the reſt, and diſputing about it, though the Argument does not conſiſt in it; and though it would be the ſame without it. But this we muſt expect from an Author who ſnatches one part of a Diſcourſe from another, and neither conſiders nor will repeat the main Argument, upon the account of which it was uſed; for then it would plainly have appeared how trifling his Exceptions were: for ſuppoſe all that he deſires were granted him, let *Seraia* be ſuppoſed not onely to be the Grandfather, but the great Grandfather of *Ezra*, (which may as well be ſuppoſed, according to our Author's Interpretation,) what does this ſignifie to my Argument, which does not purely depend upon *Ezra*'s age, but is equally valid with and without it? But the Caſe is quite otherwiſe in the preſent Controverſie; for if *Joſephus* be miſtaken in the time of *Jaddus*, our Author's Argument, and all that is built upon it, falls to the ground. But,

4. Why did not our Author, who writes a Letter in *Vindication of* Joſephus, take *Joſephus*'s account of this Matter? Now *Joſephus* tells us, that *Ezra* went from *Babylon* in the time of *Xerxes*, the Son of *Darius Hyſtaſpis*, and not in the Reign of *Artaxerxes* his Succeſſor, and that in his Reign all thoſe Facts of *Ezra* were done, which our Author mentions: But there was good reaſon for this; for,

Antiq. l. 11. *c.* 5.

1. He muſt have aſſigned a far leſs age to *Ezra* than he hath done, by about 40 years, and then there would have been no great reaſon to ſolve the Difficulty by the *Commonneſs of ſhortening Pedigrees.* And,

2. This would have ſhewn how wofully *Joſephus* had been out in his *Chronology*, even in our Author's own Computation; and then it would have looked very pleaſantly for our *Author* to call his Book, *A Letter in Vindication of* Joſephus, and yet in the ſame Book to have palpably contradicted it himſelf. But our Author likes *Joſephus*'s account very well, when it makes for him; but when it does not, he is as free to contradict him, as the Anſwerer himſelf: And therefore I think the Author hath miſtaken his Title; for inſtead of *Vindication*, he might have ſaid, *A Letter in* Contradiction *to* Joſephus; for he himſelf contradicts *Joſephus* as much as I do, and the reaſon is the ſame in both; and I would fain ſee a Reaſon why *Joſephus*'s account is more valid as to the times of *Jaddus*, than it is as to the times of *Ezra*: For my part, I know no difference, except it be one, that one is ſerviceable to our Author's Purpoſe, but not the other. But our *Author* hath made a far greater breach in the account of *Joſephus*, in the Caſe of *Nehemiah*, as we ſhall ſee immediately.

He adds, *Thoſe that he complains of are Difficulties of his own making, and proceed onely from an eager deſire to find Faults in that Story of* Joſephus. *If this had not blinded his Eyes, he might have ſeen, that admitting that Story to be true,*

true, yet there was no neceſſity either of making Jaddus *or* Sanballat *live to ſo great an Age.*

Firſt, for Jaddus, *who (as he ſaith) muſt have been* 124 *Years old at the taking of* Tyre, *the Objector proves his Age by theſe ſteps.*

1. *He takes it for granted, that* Jaddus *was High Prieſt at the time the Book of* Nehemiah *was written; but he takes this onely as probable; and therefore by his own Confeſſion, all can be but probable that he builds on it.* Now as he repreſents this, our Author would perſuade his Reader, that I am as forgetfull as he is; and that in one page I took that for *granted* as a certain and undoubted Truth, which in the next page I take onely as *probable*; whereas there is no ſuch difference in what I deliver. I ſay indeed, "That *Ne-* Anſw. "*hemiah* (ch. 13. v. 21.) intimates *Jaddus* his then being High Prieſt; —— p. 6. But I think, ſaying *Nehemiah intimates*, is not ſaying I take it for granted; but that it ſeems to be implied, or denoted, by what *Nehemiah* there delivers; *i. e.* 'tis *probable Nehemiah*'s words were ſo to be underſtood: But I did not peremptorily affirm, and take it for granted that he did ſo; and accordingly I ſay afterwards, (page 7.) that 'tis *probable Jaddus* was then High Prieſt: And therefore our Author is in the right, when he ſays, *by his own Confeſſion all can be but probable that he builds upon it*; for I do confeſs it, and deſire to *build* no more *on it*, that being ſufficient for my purpoſe: And if our Author's Account was but probable likewiſe, it will ſerve my purpoſe as well as my own; for I hope bare *Probabilities* are not ſufficient for to make Examples and Preſidents in Matters of the higheſt Importance. But which of the two is moſt *probable*, we ſhall ſee upon examining what our Author offers in oppoſition.

He adds, *Next for the time when that Book was written; it muſt have been before* Nehemiah *dyed, that is certain. But when did he dye? The Objector tells us from* Briet, *that he dyed the laſt Year of* Longimanus, *who reigned forty one Years. But to what end doth he tell us this; for he himſelf could not believe it?* And I pray mark his Reaſon, it follows; *as appears by his Words; for (ſays he) I think the leaſt we can allow for the time of* Nehemiah*'s living after he ended his Book, is thirty Years, and it is very probable it was much more.* Theſe indeed I own to be my own Words; but as the *Author* hath placed them, the ſenſe is mine no more than black and white are one colour. The whole Sentence is this: "I think the leaſt we can allow for the time of Anſw. p. 7. "*Nehemiah*'s living after he ended his Book, and for the marriageble Age "of *Manaſſes*, and then for *Jaddus*'s Age, as elder than him, the leaſt we "can allow is thirty Years, and it is very probable it was much more. —— And now does not any Man ſee the Fairneſs and Ingenuity of our Author's Anſwers, and how purely he proves, that *according to my words, Nehemiah* lived thirty years after he ended his Book; whereas all that I allow is, that *Nehemiah* lived ſome time after he ended his Book, (and which I ſuppoſe our Author will not deny;) but for the thirty years, they plainly refer to

 the

the age of *Jaddus*; and which is prov'd by a complicancy of Circumſtances, as the time *Nehemiah* lived after he ended his Book, the marriageable age of *Manaſſes*, (who was then actually married,) and the age of *Jaddus*, as elder than he; from all theſe together it is reaſonable to conclude, *Jaddus* was then thirty years old at leaſt, and probably much more, and conſequently that he was at leaſt of that age, according to this Calculation, the laſt year of *Longimanus*. But nothing at all of *Nehemiah*'s living thirty years after he ended his Book, which I never thought of; and it is impoſſible for any Man but our Author, to conclude ſo: But who can expect otherwiſe from an Author who pulls Sentences to pieces, and joins the beginning and end together, and leaves out the middle, and then draws Inferences and Proofs from it, as if it had been the ſenſe of the Perſon againſt whom he diſputes; at this rate he may make me ſay and *confeſs* what he pleaſes: And which is yet more pleaſant, he applies this very Sentence
P. 9. to the age of *Jaddus*, *and then* (ſaith he) *for the age of* Jaddus, *which our Objector ſaith, the leaſt we can allow is thirty years, and it is very probable it was much more.* But then how comes this to be applied to *Nehemiah*, and to prove, (as our Author undertakes to much purpoſe,) that then *Nehemiah* wrote nine *years before any of thoſe things happened which are written in his Book.* But when Men diſpute in this manner, and take one piece of a Sentence, and argue againſt it in one place, and take another piece of the ſame Sentence, and argue againſt it in another, and draw Concluſions from a part, which ought to be drawn from the whole; it is no great Wonder, that as they miſrepreſent their Adverſaries, ſo they contradict themſelves. And after ſuch a curious ſtrain of anſwering, our Author thus gravely concludes, *Now this I think our Author could not mean,* (*i. e.*) that the Book of *Nehemiah was written nine years before the things happened that were written in it*, (and he may be ſure of it,) *and therefore he doth but amuſe us with that idle Quotation.* Now indeed the Quotation out of *Briet* was mine, but the Reaſon is the Author's, and if that be *idle* and *amuſing*, it is no bodies but his own.

But why, I pray, is a Quotation out of *Briet idle?* Is he an Author ſo very trifling, that it is a Reproach to quote any thing out of him? But our Author hath the moſt expeditious Method of clearing his hands of Authors that are not for him, that ever I met with; *Diodorus*, *Plutarch*, and the reſt, are a company of *Heathens*, and *malitious*, and there is an Anſwer for them; to quote out of *Briet* is *idle*, and there is an end of that: And if Authors will not be turned off in this manner, they are importunate and troubleſome; for our Authour is not at leiſure to give them any other Anſwer.

He adds, *Howſoever, as if he had proved ſomething by this, he infers from it,* (*I know not how,*) *that* Jaddus *was High Prieſt the laſt Year of* Artaxerxes.
Ch. 12. Now I thought I had expreſſed it plain enough, but to gratifie him, I will
ver. 22. tell him once again how I infer it. *Nehemiah* in his Book intimates *Jaddus* being

being High Prieſt, *Nehemiah*, according to *Briet*, dyed the laſt year of *Artaxerxes*, and his Book was written ſome time before he dyed; and therefore according to *Briet*'s Account, *Jaddus* muſt have been High Prieſt at leaſt the laſt year of *Artaxerxes*; and whether our Author knows it or no, this Inference was plain enough before; and it is impoſſible for any Man beſides our Author to make any other: But this is *idle* and *amuſing*; and therefore our Author tells us again, *Though I do not ſee which way he proves this, I ſee very clear Reaſons to the contrary, which I think are unanſwerable.* Now I wiſh I could ſee them too; for I confeſs, that *unanſwerable Reaſons* are certainly *Reaſons*. But I doubt he hath turned the Proſpective, and looks upon his own Reaſons with the magnifying end, as he did mine with the other; for that his Reaſons (as he calls them) are no clear Reaſons at all, much leſs unanſwerable ones, will appear upon conſidering them; they are theſe: 1. *That the Book of* Nehemiah *was not written till after the death of* Longimanus. 2. *That* Jaddus *was not High Prieſt at the death of* Artaxerxes, *norpr obably born then, nor long after, till the end of* Darius Nothus.

Firſt, *That* Nehemiah *did not write in any part of* Artaxerxes's *Reign, but either in or after the time of* Darius, *his immediate Succeſſor.* But why this Disjunctive *in* or *after*, and *after* in great black letters too? And he ſays he *inſiſts upon it, that it was* after *the Reign of* Darius; and therefore to return him his Obſervation the page before, I ſuppoſe there is not more difference in ſaying, (if I had ſaid it,) *That I take it for granted, and yet I take it onely as probable*, than there is in ſaying that it is *in* or *after*, and yet immediately to *inſiſt* upon it that it is *after*. Well: But our Authour does inſiſt upon it, that it was *after*. And how does he prove this? Why truly by a *Hebrew* Criticiſm, for he adds, *ſo the* Hebrew *Words ſhew, that he writ when that Reign was expired, for there it is ſaid that the Heads of the* Levites, *and alſo the Prieſts*, were recorded עַל over *or* throughout *the Reign of* Darius, *it appears that the words are ſo to be underſtood, by what follows in the next verſe, where it is ſaid, that the Heads of the* Levites *were recorded in the Books of the* Chronicles עַד *till the days of* Johanan; *that is, till he came to be High Prieſt.* Now all our Author's Proof depends upon this Hebrew Criticiſm, and upon the difference between *Hhal* and *Hhadh* in that Language; and to which I anſwer:

1. That עַל does generally ſignifie *ſuper* or *ſupra*, *upon* or *over*: But then thoſe Senſes are determin'd by the ſubject Matter, as *Exod.* 29. 20, 21. *Thou ſhalt kill* the Ram, and take of his Blood and put it *upon* the Tip of the Right Ear of *Aaron*, and *upon* the Tip of the Right Ear of his Sons, and *upon* the Thumb of his Right Hand, and ſprinkle the Blood *upon* the Altar; in all which the word עַל is uſed; ſo likewiſe for *over*, 2 *Kings* 18. 18. *Eliakim* who was *over* the Houſhold; there alſo עַל is uſed, and it ſignifies *præpoſitus, over*, by way of Authority or Government: But for our Author's *over*, *i. e.* as he interprets it, *throughout*, is, I ſuppoſe, a Miſtake

through-

throughout; *i. e.* from one end to the other: And I desire our Author to shew me where it means so, either in Scripture, or is so interpreted by any Hebrew Lexicon; and I hope there is some difference between *over* a Household, and *throughout* a Reign. And I wonder what sense he will make of being *recorded* over *a Reign*! He found that would not doe, and therefore he must put in his own word *throughout*, though he hath no manner of Authority for it, onely it would signifie nothing to his purpose, except he had done so: And therefore,

2. עַל sometimes signifies the same with עַד, and means as much as *ad*, or *usque ad*, *to* or *till*; and so *Vatablus* would have it rendred in this very place, *usque ad Regnum Darii*, *to* or *till the Reign of* Darius; and to say no more, so all Interpreters that I have met with render it. And does our Author think that his little Criticism, and singular Interpretation is sufficient to bear down the Authority of all Interpreters? He tells me afterwards, and he may now take it to himself, *He values his own Opinion too much, who would impose it on others at this rate.* However, P. 22.

3. If this was granted him, it will by no means serve his turn; for suppose the Heads of the *Levites*, &c. were recorded *throughout* the Reign of *Darius* the *Persian*, why then *Jaddus* must have been high Priest in the Reign of that *Darius*, which notwithstanding is directly contrary to our Author's Chronology, who places his Grandfather *Joiada* in that Reign, and *Jaddus* himself 68 years after, in the Reign of *Ochus*; for thus it is in *Nehemiah*: *The Levites in the days of* Eliashib, Joiada, *and* Johanan, *and* Jaddua, *were recorded chief of the Fathers*; *also the Priests*, *to the Reign of* Darius *the* Persian. Now suppose *to* the Reign, meant *throughout* the Reign, then *Jaddus* must have been High Priest in the Reign of *Darius Nothus*, for otherwise the *Levites* could not be recorded in *his* days, *throughout* that Reign. But this will serve our Author's turn as little as if *Jaddus* had been High Priest in the Reign of his Predecessor, *Artaxerxes*; and so he might be too, though his Criticism was allowed him: But for that Ch. 12. ver. 23.

Our Author tells us, *I take* Nehemiah's *meaning in two verses to be thus in short*: *Having given Account of the Heads of the Priests that were in time of* Jeshua, *the High Priest*; *and afterwards of them that were in the time of his Son* Joiakim: *Having also given Account of the Heads of the* Levites *that were in* Joiakim's *time*, *he thought some Account would be expected of them that were in the days of the following High Priests.* Very well! He had given account of the Heads of the Priests in *Jeshua*'s time, and he had given account of the Heads of the Priests and Levites in his Son *Joiakim*'s time, and he thought some account might be expected of them that were in the days of the following High Priests; but I hope no body expected that he should give an account of more than he knew, or of more than was in his own time; or, if they did, I suppose he neither could nor would offer to doe it, to humor any Man's Expectation; except he did it by the *Spirit of Prophesie*, which Ver. 22,23. Neh. 12. 1. 7. V. 12, 21. V. 8, 9, & 24, 25, 26.

our

our Author tells us in the Case of *Darius*, he *thinks no Man will say.* He immediately adds, *And therefore he inserted these two Verses*; *i.e.* He inserted these two Verses to give an account of the Heads of the Priests and Levites, that were in the days of the following High Priests; that is, of the following High Priests that were in own his time; for 'tis ridiculous to expect from him account of the heads of the Priests and Levites that were in the times of High Priests who were after his time: But then it follows, that *Jaddus* was High Priest in the days of *Nehemiah*, and before he ended his Book; for the Words are these: *The Levites in the days of* Eliashib, Joiada, *and* Johanan, *and* Jaddua, *were recorded chief of the Fathers, also the Priests to the Reign of* Darius *the Persian.* And what account, I pray, is this, but an account of the Levites in the days of all those High Priests, even in the days of *Jaddua*, as well as of the rest? But this, as plain as it is, our Author is not for, and therefore tells us, *that he inserted these Verses, wherein he tells us, That as for the Levites which were in the days of* Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, *and* Jaddua, *the Heads of these* Levites, *and also the Priests, all that were in the Reign of* Darius, *were recorded in the Books of the* Chronicles; *but afterwards the Priests were not recorded, but onely the Heads of the Levites, and those onely during the High Priesthood of* Eliashib *and* Joiada, *who were then dead*; *but not of* Johanan, *who it seems was then newly come to be High Priest when this Book was written.* Now here is such an Interpretation of Scripture, that I defie all the World to shew me the Fellow of it. For, Ch. 12. ver. 22.

1. The Text saith, The Levites in the Days of *Eliashib*, *Joiada*, and *Johanan*, and *Jaddua*, *were* recorded: And our Author says, the Levites in the days of *Johanan* and *Jaddua were not* recorded, but onely in the days of *Eliashib* and *Joiada*; that is, he expounds Scripture, by downright contradicting it, and in expres Terms.

2. He tells us, that *the Levites that were in the days of* Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, *and* Jaddua, *the Heads of those Levites, and also the Priests, all that were in the Reign of* Darius Nothus, *were recorded in the Book of the Chronicles: But afterwards, i.e.* after the Reign of *Darius Nothus, the Priests were not recorded, but onely the Heads of the Levites, and those onely during the High Priesthood of* Eliashib *and* Joiada, *who were then dead.* Now we are to take notice that our Author, page 8. and in his Scheme page 10. makes *Eliashib* High Priest at least twenty years before the Reign of *Darius Nothus*, and that he dyed in his *Reign*, and *Joiada* was High Priest some years before the death of that Prince. And does not our Author begin to see what woeful Work he hath made on't? That is to say, the Heads of the Levites, and also the Priests, in the days of *Eliashib* and *Joiada*, were recorded in the Book of the Chronicles; but *afterwards*, *i.e.* in the days of the same *Eliashib* and *Joiada*, the Priests were not, but onely the Heads of the Levites were recorded in the Chronicles. And that is to say again, That the Heads of the Levites, and also the Priests, *were* recorded in the Books of the Chronicles,

during the whole Reign of *Darius*, and that the Prieſts *were not* recorded, but onely the Heads of the Levites, during the *ſame Reign*, and in the *ſame Book*. And that is to ſay yet again, that the *Heads of the Levites, and alſo the Prieſts*, all that were in the Reign of *Darius Nothus*, were recorded; but *afterwards onely* the Heads of the Levites, and *not* the Prieſts, during the High Prieſthood of *Eliaſhib*, which was twenty years *before* the Reign of the ſame *Darius*. And yet he tells us in this matter, that he *thinks his Reaſons unanſwerable*. Now I cannot tell what Opinion our Author may have of his own Reaſons; but heretofore Men did not uſe to take plain Contradic-
ver. 22. tions for unanſwerable Reaſons. He adds, *As for* Jaddua, *he is mentioned both here, and before in this Chapter, not as being High Prieſt then, (how could he in his Father's days?) but onely as being then living, and Heir apparent of the Prieſthood.* And here we have another curious vein of Interpretation: For I wonder where our Author finds, either in Scripture, or any where elſe, that where any Things or Actions are dated in the *Days* of a Perſon of publick Station, that it is not to be underſtood of the *Days*, *i. e.* during the time of his publick Station, but of the *Days* of his Life; as when it is ſaid in the *Days* of King *Charles*, it means the Days of his Reign and publick Adminiſtration, and not of his Life. But ſuppoſe it might mean otherwiſe; how comes the very ſame Expreſſion to ſignifie one thing with reſpect to *Jaddua*, and another with reſpect to all the reſt mentioned in the ſame place? The words are, *in the days* of *Eliaſhib*, *Joiada*, and *Johanan*, and *Jaddua*; that is, according to our Author's Interpretation, in the days of the High Prieſthood of *Eliaſhib*, *Joiada*, and *Johanan*; but in the days of the Heir apparentſhip of *Jaddua*: Juſt as if a Man ſhould ſay, in the days of Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, *Charles* the firſt and *ſecond*, he ſhould mean the actual Reigns of the three firſt; but the other onely as *living, and Heir apparent to the Crown*. And yet in this fine manner does our Author interpret Scripture; and *Jaddua* muſt be mentioned as next Heir, contrary both to all Rules of Interpretation, and even to common ſenſe. But in truth, as our Author has handled the matter, it is impoſſible to know what *Jaddua* was mentioned at all for, or *Johanan* either; for our Author tells us, that the ground and Reaſon of the adding theſe two Verſes by *Nehemiah* was, for that *having given account of the Heads of the Prieſts in the times of* Jeſhua *and* Joiakim, *and of the Heads of the Levites, in* Joiakim's *time, he thought ſome account would be expected of them that were in the days of the following High Prieſts*. Very well; and to ſatisfie that Expectation *Nehemiah*, according to our Author, gives account of the Prieſts and Levites that were in the days of *Eliaſhib* and *Joiada*, but not of *Johanan* nor *Jaddua*, who it ſeems was onely Heir apparent. But then what are *Johanan* and *Jaddua* mentioned for? Why truly for juſt nothing at all: For if the reaſon of inſerting theſe two Verſes, was to give account of the Prieſts and Levites that were in the times of the *following High Prieſts*, then there was reaſon

for

for mentioning *Eliashib* and *Joiada*, but no reason at all for the mentioning of *Johanan* and *Jaddua*; for according to him they are not recorded during their time; nay, one of them was not then High Priest. And so if our Author please, he hath given us a Reason why they should not be mentioned; but why they should be mentioned he hath given us no Reason. And now does not any Man see what great Reason our Author had to ask *where* the Difficulties are; and to tell us he can see none: And when he is so wofully bewildred and perplexed, that he contradicts the Scriptures, himself, and common Sense, to solve the Difficulties, to ask, *Where are they?* and *I confess I do not see any Difficulty*, is somewhat extraordinary. P. 4.

And this I think is abundantly sufficient to satisfie our Author, that his Reasons are not unanswerable: And if I had nothing else to doe but to answer him, I should have taken leave of this Point, but that I find another Answer to this, and which I confess is not made up of Contradictions, like that of our Author's; and therefore being more desirous to prove my Assertion, than to answer our Author, I shall briefly consider it; and consider withall whether it be sufficient to clear this Story of *Josephus* from the *Suspition* which I charge upon it. The Answer is that which the *Germane* Divines made to *Scaliger*, *That these two Verses were not writ by* Nehemiah, *but inserted by a later hand.* In answer to this I observe.

1. Suppose this was an Insertion by a later Hand, it is plain, that the Insertor makes the High Priesthood of *Jaddus*, and the Reign of *Darius* the *Persian* contemporary; and then the Question returns, What *Darius* was this? Whether *Darius Nothus*, or *Codomanus?* If *Nothus*, the Difficulty still remains, and *Jaddus* would have been very near that age at the time assigned for *Alexander*'s coming to *Jerusalem*; and especially if we shall farther add, that *Josephus* reckons him dying about the same time that *Alexander* dyed, and which was some years after that time of his reputed advance to *Jerusalem*: If *Codomanus*, and according to our Author's *Hebrew* Criticism, the Heads of the Priests and Levites were recorded *over* or *throughout* his Reign, then 'tis unaccountable why they did not say, till the Days or Reign of *Alexander*, which was such a remarkable *Epocha*, and when their Government received such a remarkable Alteration. Again: If *Codomanus*, then I would fain see a good Reason why the Name of an High Priest, and the Heads of the Priests and Levites, *recorded* in his time, should at such a distance be inserted into an History that concerned matters acted and done almost an hundred Years before. And therefore,

2. Although it be admitted that there have been such Insertions, yet they have an immediate reference to the Story into which they are inserted, either by way of Connexion, or Explication of the subject Matter, or by immediate Addition or Continuation: as the account of the Death of *Moses* is added to his Books by a later hand, and things of the like nature: But to insert into the middle of a Book an account of Persons who lived a whole

whole Age after, I ſuppoſe is not to be found in Scripture, nor yet in any other Hiſtorian. However let that be as it will, that which I inſiſt upon is,

3. That this is purely arbitrary, and mere Conjecture, and has no plain Proof to ſupport it; and for ought I know the onely Ground of it was to anſwer the Difficulties of this Story in *Joſephus*, and I would refer it to any unprejudiced Man, which is moſt reaſonable; to reject that Story in *Joſephus*, or to make new and unheard of Methods to interpret the Scriptures: And I wonder what reaſon can be given for putting Strains and Difficulties on the Scriptures, to reconcile *Joſephus*. Is it impoſſible *Joſephus* ſhould be in the wrong? And if Men who are ſo very tender of the Credit of *Joſephus*, would not allow him ſo to be, they might as well make the Account in him *inſitious*, to reconcile him to Scripture, as the Scripture Account *inſitious*, to reconcile it to *Joſephus*. And therefore,

4. This ſolves one Difficulty by another as great, or greater: When was this Inſertion made? By whom? Upon what occaſion? And how does it appear? Is there any thing like it in the whole Scripture? And when they come to be compared, and caſt into the Balance, Is there any greater Evidence or Preſumption, that theſe are Inſertions, than that *Joſephus* is miſtaken? Theſe are material Queſtions in the preſent Caſe; and if they cannot be anſwered, (and I ſuppoſe they cannot,) but by bare Conjectures, the whole Reaſon of my Argument affects theſe Inſertions, as well as the Story of *Joſephus*; and that is, that it is *doubtfull* and *ſuſpitious* whether there are ſuch Inſertions or no; and conſequently, that *no regular Inference can be drawn from thence, in reference to Practice.* And I would fain know, whether any Man can or dare eſtabliſh a point of Practice from ſuch arbitrary Conjectures; and my Concluſion ſtands firm, *That Men who act upon Principles of Sincerity, would be very fearfull of uſing* ſuch things that ſtand upon pure Conjecture *in matters of Practice*; *for however Chronologers may diſpute*, and frame Arguments to reconcile their *Hypotheſis*, *yet when it comes to a point of Conſcience, Men that have a care of their Souls will hardly venture to act* upon mere Suppoſitions, and conjectural Preſumptions: So that let this Anſwer go as far as it can, it will never extend to my main Concluſion, which is drawn from the *Suſpitionſneſs* of that Story in *Joſephus*; and the Anſwer that is given, is as ſuſpitious as the Story it ſelf. And thus much to the Anſwer of the *Germane* Divines: I now return to our *Author*.

Anſw. p. 11.

And here he ſtarts an Objection, *That if his Interpretation be true*, Nehemiah *muſt have lived to a very great Age*; and he anſwers, *No doubt he did ſo*, and he proves it by theſe Steps: *That he was Cup bearer to* Artaxerxes, *in the 20th of his Reign, when he may be ſuppoſed to have been 25 Years of Age*; *and after that he lived to ſee the High Prieſthood paſs from Father to Son for four Generations, and ſaw a fifth in View*, (Jaddua.) And then adds, *All this might very well be, if* Nehemiah *were born* 470 *Years before Chriſt, and writ in the*

P. 8.

the Year 347 (it ſhould be 374) *before Chriſt.* No doubt of it, all this might then very well be; and *Nehemiah* would then be, according to our Author, 104 years old. But what Authority hath our Author for this? Why truly, no bodies but his own; and he might, if he had found it for his turn, have brought down *Nehemiah*'s Age to the time of *Alexander*, as ſome others have done, and then it had been but ſaying, *All this might very well be, if* Nehemiah *writ in the Year* 332 *before Chriſt*; and ſo the Matter is fairly proved. At this rate our Author may very eaſily anſwer Objections, and they muſt be ſtrange Difficulties indeed that can ſtand before him. Let a Man but ſuppoſe the main thing in Controverſie, and it is a hard caſe if by the help of that he cannot anſwer all Objections. The Queſtion is concerning the Age of *Nehemiah*, and our Authour proves it by ſuppoſing it, *if* he was born 470, and wrote 374 years before Chriſt, then all this might be; that is to ſay, if *Nehemiah* lived 104 years, then he was 104 years old. And that is the thing to be proved; how does he prove that *Nehemiah* was 104 years old, or that he wrote 374 years before Chriſt? Why, it is far eaſier to ſuppoſe ſome things than to prove them; and if they will not prove themſelves, they muſt e'en doe as well as they can, our Author can lend them no Aſſiance.

In the mean time it may be a little diverting to obſerve how our Author's Computation, and *Joſephus*'s Account of this matter agree, whom notwithſtanding he pretends to *vindicate*. *Joſephus*'s Account is, that *Nehemiah* came to *Jeruſalem* the 25th of *Xerxes*, and plainly intimates, that he dyed in his Reign: The Author's Account is, that he wrote his Book 374 years before Chriſt, in the beginning of *Johanan*'s High Prieſthood; which, according to his Calculation, is in the 31ſt of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, and how long he might live after is uncertain: Now from the Death of *Xerxes*, to the 31ſt of *Artaxerxes Mnemon*, is but 91 years, thus computed: *Antiq. l.* 11. *c.* 5.

Artaxerxes Longim. reigned	41
Darius Nothus	19
Artaxerxes Mnemon	31
	91

This, I ſuppoſe, is but a ſmall Difference with a *Vindicator*, who can ſee no Difficulties: In the mean time, he that ſo palpably contradicts *Joſephus*, might, one would think, have been a little ſparing, and not have made ſuch a terrible buſineſs of finding Faults in *Joſephus*; except he thinks that no Body may doe ſo, but he that calls himſelf his *Vindicator*. However, that which I would draw from hence is, That if our Author believes his own Account, let him deny my Inference if he can,

Answ. p. 11. That *since* Josephus's *Errours and Mistakes concerning these times, are so many and gross, any man that acted upon Principles of Sincerity, would be very fearfull to use an Example taken out of him in Matters of Practice.* Our Author now and then gives some hard words, but in the main is very obliging, and I ought to be thankfull; for though he does not like my way, yet he proves my point as well as I can desire, and his Premisses will fit my Conclusion as well as my own: For our Author hath found a much greater Fault in *Josephus*'s Chronology than I have done; and my Argument returns upon him, if *Josephus* was so notoriously out in the Times of *Nehemiah*, and according to our Author at least 91 years; then it plainly follows, that he that owns him so wofully mistaken, can never himself safely rely upon his sole Authority: For I would fain see a good reason, if *Josephus* was so notoriously mistaken in the time of *Nehemiah*, he might not as well be mistaken in the time of *Jaddus*. *Nehemiah* was the chief Governour of *Judæa*, as well as *Jaddus*; and 'tis probable that his Reign was recorded in their Chronicles, and publick Matters dated from it; at least they were so as much in the Case of *Nehemiah*, as in the Case of *Jaddus*, and *Josephus* had the same opporunity and means to know the times of one as well as the other: And therefore being so much mistaken concerning a Prince and Governour of his own Nation, and one also who was reigning not long from those very Times about which is the Controversie; for, according to our Author, *Nehemiah* wrote his Book but 41 years before the times of *Alexander*; This is plainly argumentative against our Author, and he himself (if he will be consistent) cannot safely depend upon his Relations of those Times, and much less draw a practical Inference from an Example in those Times, which stands upon nothing else but the Authority and Relation of *Josephus*. Suppose an English Historian, and especially such a one as was in the Post of *Josephus*, that could examine all the Records of the Countrey, should say, that Archbishop *Cranmer* lived and dyed in the Reign of *Edward* IV. (and the reason is yet stronger with respect to a chief Governour,) whether any Man would depend upon what he delivered about those Times, which stood onely upon his single Assertion and Authority. I know well enough that some, to save the Credit of *Josephus* in this point, say, that the Times or Reigns of the *Persian* Kings (during that Monarchy) were not so well known then, as they have been since; but this is not only said without Proof, but 'tis manifestly false: For we find in Scripture, (as far as the Scripture goes,) that the Names of the *Persian* Kings were recorded, and there is no reason to think but they were so afterwards; and it is ridiculous to think, that in *Judæa*, which was a Branch of the Monarchy, and under the Government and Authority of those Kings, the Times of their Kings should not be known; but one King, especially at our Author's distance of 91 years, should be con-

Vossius.

confounded for another. Beſides, the Matter in Controverſie is a demonſtration of it, which is the High Prieſt's *taking an Oath of Fidelity* to thoſe Kings, (and which *Joſephus* mentions too,) and probably enough all other great Officers in places of Truſt and Importance; and it would be very ſtrange, if the Reigns of thoſe Kings could not be known, to whom reſpectively they took an Oath of Allegiance. Our Author flurts at *Calviſius*, and tells me, *I could not have found a fitter Man to take my part; for he had a Quarrel againſt* Joſephus, *for writing ſuch things as would not conſiſt with his Chronology.* P. 18. And it ſeems our Author hath the ſame Quarrel too, (onely he is a little more courtly than *Calviſius*, and calls it *Vindicating*;) for *Joſephus* writes ſuch things as will no more conſiſt with our Author's Chronology, than they will with that of *Calviſius*; and to ſay the Truth, our Author will fit my turn every jot as well as *Calviſius*, and my Argument concludes as well from what our Author ſays, as from what *Calviſius* ſays.

Our Author adds, *Secondly*, Jaddus *being High Prieſt at the time of* Artaxerxes's *Death, is not onely groundleſs; but highly improbable*; and his reaſon is, *For if this had been true, there muſt have been living and dying no leſs than five High Prieſts, in one direct Line, from Father to Son, in the ſpace of 22 years.* And how does our Author prove this? Why, he does it by enumeration of Particulars, and plain deduction, thus; as *Joiakim, Eliaſhib, Joiada, Johanan*; there are four, and the fifth is *Jaddus*, who was juſt come to the Prieſthood; and therefore there muſt needs be five High Prieſts *living and dying* in that ſpace, becauſe *one* of the five was living, and juſt entred upon the High Prieſthood. Now who would ever expect that our Author ſhould *ſee* any Difficulties, when he cannot *ſee* that he contradicts himſelf the very next Line. But five High Prieſts *living and dying* in 22 years, would make a great wonderment whether it were true or no. And juſt ſuch another is the Caſe of *Joiakim*, of whom our Author ſays, that *it appears that he dyed the ſame year, i. e.* in the firſt of *Nehemiah*; and that is again any time even in the beginning of the *ſame year*: For he tells us immediately, that *His Son* Eliaſhib *was High Prieſt at the time when the Walls of* Jeruſalem *was building*; and that is yet again very ſoon after *Nehemiah* came to *Jeruſalem*: So that according to our Author's account, by *living and dying*, when it reſpects *Joiakim*, one of the five, it means *dying*, and not living; when another, (*Jaddus*,) it means *living*, and not *dying*: And if a Man will not take theſe for *unanſwerable Reaſons*, he is querulous and unreaſonable; and as our Author ſays, *is angry, and greedy of Objections againſt* Joſephus, *and did not regard what might be ſaid in his Vindication.* P. 18. However at laſt, as to this Matter of *living and dying*, the five High Prieſts are come to three, and whether that was *onely* in the ſpace of 22 years we come now to examine.

For

For the Proof of this our Author adds, Firſt, *His* (Jaddus's) *Grandfather's great Grandfather*, Joiakim, *was High Prieſt within the Time while* Nehemiah *was Governour*; and adds farthermore, *that is certain*, but gives us no proof of it, onely refers in the margin to *Nehem.* 12. 28. (the 26. it ſhould be.) And what is ſaid there for our Author's purpoſe? Why, the Text ſaith, that *Theſe* (*i. e.* the chief of the Levites, mentioned the verſes before,) *were in the days of* Joiakim, *the Son of* Jeſhua, *and in the days of* Nehemiah *the Governour, and of* Ezra *the Prieſt:* And therefore it plainly follows, by *unanſwerable Reaſon*, that *Joiakim* and *Nehemiah* were contemporaries; as if it were impoſſible for them that were *chief of the Levites* in the time of *Joiakim*, (though he dyed ſome years before *Nehemiah*,) to be alſo *chief of the Levites* in the times of *Nehemiah*, who was Governour ſome time after. He might as well have made *Zerubbabel* and *Nehemiah* contemporary; for in the ſame Chapter (v. 27.) it is ſaid, *All* Iſrael, *in the days of* Zerubbabel, *and in the days of* Nehemiah, *gave the Portion of the Singers*, &c. This is juſt ſuch another reaſon, as becauſe Bp. *Bilſon* was Bp. of *Wincheſter* in the days of Q. *Eliz.* and K. *James*, therefore Q. *Eliz.* and K. *James* were contemporaries in their Government. Well; I perceive when Men are once ſet upon *unanſwerable Reaſons*, there is no end of them. But however, as to the time of *Joiakim*'s dying, our Author can ſay nothing to, but it is plain that his Son *Eliaſhib* was High Prieſt when the Wall of *Jeruſalem* was building; and that is, when it firſt began to be built; and that is plainly, ſoon after *Nehemiah* came to *Jeruſalem*, and he might be High Prieſt long enough before that, for any thing our Author ſaith to the contrary. However *Joſephus*, whom our Author *vindicates* and *contradicts*, as he finds it for his purpoſe,) plainly places *Eliaſhib* in the time of *Xerxes*, and as plainly ſays, that *Joiakim* was dead, and *Eliaſhib* was High Prieſt, before *Nehemiah* came up to *Jeruſalem*: And then our Author's 22 years for three High Prieſts, might have been 62, or at leaſt 52; and that would not have been ſuch a wonderfull Matter. Or however, ſuppoſe *Joſephus* miſtaken, and that *Nehemiah* came to *Jeruſalem* (as it is plain he did) in the 20th of *Artaxerxes*, *Eliaſhib* was then High Prieſt; and he might have been ſo, for any thing our Author knows, ſome at leaſt, if not many years before; and then his 22 years may be 25, or more, and no body knows how many more. Well; but our Author proves it, Eliaſhib *was High Prieſt when the Wall of* Jeruſalem *was building*, (*i. e.* the 20th of *Artaxerxes.*) *And he was High Prieſt the* 32d of *Artaxerxes.* Eliaſhib *continued much longer, as I underſtand it; but ſuppoſe he dyed that very year.* But before we proceed any farther, how does our Author prove that *Eliaſhib* was High Prieſt in the 32d of *Artaxerxes?* Why, he refers us again in the Margin to *Nehem.* 13. 28. Now this proves his point very extraordinarily. The Words are, *And one of the Sons of* Joiada, *the*

Compare Neh. 3. 1. with 2. 11.

the Son of Eliashib *the High Priest, was Son-in-law to* Sanballat, *the Horonite.* From whence our Author concludes, that *Eliashib* was at that time High Priest. Now we are to remember, that our *Author* tells us, that *Nehemiah* wrote his Book immediately after *Johanan* came to be High Priest; *i. e.* the Son of *Joiada*, and the Grandson of this *Eliashib*; *i. e.* according to his own account about 37 years after *Eliashib* dyed: and that is again about 60 years after the 32d of *Artaxerxes.* And yet forsooth upon the closing up his Book, and ending it, because he mentions the Son of *Joiada*, the Son of *Eliashib*, the High Priest, it must needs be concluded that then *Eliashib* was High Priest, though it perfectly contradicts all that our Author hath said upon this Argument. But this I suppose we are to take for one of our Author's *unanswerable Reasons.* Now for my part I should be glad to see *Reasons*, and let *unanswerable* alone; for of all the *Reasons* that ever I met with, *unanswerable Reasons* are the worst. For all that, as if our Author had punctually prov'd his Point, he adds, *Suppose he* (Eliashib) *dyed that very year*, (the 32d of *Artaxerxes*,) *there must be some time allowed for his Son* Joiada *after him, and then for his Grandchild* Johanan; *but after the* 32d *of* Artaxerxes, *there were but* 8 *years more before the end of his Reign.* And then adds, *We have scarce known a Change of five Popes in the time that he allows for so many to come and go in a Hereditary Succession.* As for five *coming and going*, I have told him already they are but three; and therefore the allowance of five is his own allowance, but none of mine: and I hope, even in our own memories, not onely three, but three times three Popes have sat in the Chair in the space of 26, or 30 years. But as to his comparison, 'tis true according to present Custome they chuse only such Persons to be Popes, who are of very great Age; but this is accidental: But if we consider the nature of the thing, 'tis much more reasonable that Persons who are successively elected into an Office, should for the generality continue longer in that Office, than when it goes by hereditary Succession; and the Reason is plain, for the Childrens Life is *concurrent* with the Parents, and so much as is added to the Father's time of Possession, is substracted from the next Heir, and his Life, though not his Possession, wears out concurrently with his Predecessor; and if at any time in hereditary Successions a Predecessor lives to so great an age, so much of his Son's age is worn out too, and his time of Possession must consequently be the less, as he is so much older when he comes into Possession: And therefore I cannot tell, for my Life, what our Author means when he adds, *And then the age of* Jaddus *being considered, (of which our Objector saith when he came to be High Priest, the least we can allow is* 30 *years, and it is probable it was much more,) if it was but* 30 *years, then the age of* Joiakim *when he dyed, must have been at least* 90 *years, his Son* Eliashib *at least* 62, *his Son* Joiada *near* 70, *his Son* Johanan *near* 60, *and each of these it is probable much more; and four of these must have been born when their Fathers were but* 20 *year old.* Now at first sight a Man would imagine the Inference was clean P. 9.

contrary, and that becauſe *Jaddus* came to be then High Prieſt, therefore thoſe before him, his Father and Grandfather, did not live to ſo great ages; and if they muſt live to ſo great ages, if *Jaddus* came to be High Prieſt the laſt of *Longimanus*, what ages muſt they be of, if he came to be High Prieſt (as our Author intimates) the 17th of *Ochus*, and which was, according to his account, 83 years after? And if they muſt be of ſuch ages if *Jaddus* came to the Prieſthood at 30, what muſt they be if he came (as according to our Author) to be High Prieſt at 63 years of age? But this I ſuppoſe he did not think on, and what was in his Head when he writ this I cannot deviſe; and methinks the Author ſhould have been ſo kind to his Reader, to have proved the Conſequence that he charges here upon my Aſſertion, and not have left him to have made it out himſelf, eſpecially when it requires ſuch extraordinary Skill to make it intelligible, not only to a common but to any Reader at all; for I am affraid it would puzzle all the Arithmeticians in Chriſtendom, to make any account of it, as our Author hath laid it: For ſuppoſe *Joiakim* dyed at 90, and the other four born when their Fathers were but 20, the ſtate would be thus: When *Joiakim* at the time of of his Death was 90, at the ſame time his Son *Eliaſhib*, being born when his Father was 20, would be 70, his Son *Joiada* 50, *Johanan* 30, and *Jaddus* 10. But then what is the meaning of his Son *Eliaſhib* being 62 when he dyed, when according to this account he muſt be 70 when he came to the Prieſthood: In like manner our Author ſays *Johanan* muſt be near 60 when he dyed, when yet according to this account he could be but 50; for if *Jaddus* was born when *Johanan* was 20 years old, then when *Jaddus* was 30, *Johanan* was 50. Theſe therefore are myſtical Inferences and Riddles, and ſo muſt remain till our Author explains them. In the mean time, if there were any Difficulties in the ages of theſe High Prieſts, as our Author, by conſequence from my *Hypotheſis*, calculates them, they are plainly greater from his own: For according to him *Jaddus* lived to be 83 years old, he was High Prieſt 20 years according to him, then when he came to the Prieſthood he was 62; and then ſuppoſing his Father *Johanan* 26 when *Jaddus* was born, *Johanan* when he dyed muſt be 89. In like manner take the ſame courſe upwards to the reſt of the High Prieſts: *Johanan*, according to him was High Prieſt 32 years, then when he came to the Prieſthood he was 57; and to this add 26, as his Father's age when he was born, then *Joiada* when he dyed muſt have been 83. *Joiada* was High Prieſt 36, deduct that from 83, and when he became High Prieſt he was 47; add to this 26, as his Father's age at his Birth, and then *Eliaſhib* his Father when he dyed muſt have been 73. *Eliaſhib* was High Prieſt 34, deduct that from 73; and then when he became High Prieſt he was 39; to this add 26, as his Father's age when he was born, and then *Joiakim* at his death muſt have been 65. And now on which ſide is the Difficulty? Which is greater, to ſay *that* Joiakim *when he dyed muſt have been* 90, Eliaſhib 62, Joiada *near* 70, Johanan *near* 60;

or

or that which is the Conſequence of our Author's account, *Joiakim* when he dyed muſt be 65, *Eliashib* 73, *Joiada* 83, *Johanan* 89, and *Jaddus* 83? And 'tis probable, if this account be true, it was much more; for if any one of theſe Prieſts had not Children at the age of 26, if their eldeſt ſhould prove a Daughter, or infirm, and unfit for the Prieſthood, or ſhould dye, or in ſhort if each of them had not at that age the very Son that ſucceeded him, then ſtill the whole account muſt be proportionably lengthned. And to conclude this in our Author's words, *If any one of theſe things did not happen, then our* Author's *groundwork falls; but that all things happened thus I think there is no Probability.*

Our Author having ſaid this to diſprove my Account, comes to make good his own; and ſuppoſe for Quietneſs ſake that I ſhould grant him all that he has ſaid, how indifferently ſoever he hath proved it, that there are Difficulties in my Account, and it is not probable; What then? Why then I ought not to eſtabliſh any Doctrine upon it, nor draw any practical Inference from it, nor confirm or prove a Point of Conſcience from any ſuch difficult and ſuſpitious Stories. Nor do I; but however that is the Caſe I diſpute againſt. And if our Author could ſhew as many Difficulties and Improbabilities in my account as he pretends, What is that to the purpoſe? Do the Difficulties in my account clear the Difficulties that are in another account? That indeed is an Argument againſt my Account, but 'tis none at all againſt my Inference and Deduction, which ſtands good againſt him, except he can clear up his own account, as well as find faults in mine. And what does he ſay for that? *On the other hand,* ſaith he, *there is nothing improbable in that Account which I offered before.* And ſuppoſe I ſhould grant him that too, What then? Is every account true that is not *improbable?* Or, may a Man deduce Conſequences for Practice in high and important Duties, from every Story that is not *improbable?* How eaſie is it in Matters of difficult and abſtruſe Hiſtory, to frame Schemes to our ſelves that have no *Improbability* in them! But is that a Reaſon to argue from thence to Practice? But let us ſee how *probable* our Author makes his account: He tells us, Jaddus *might have been born any year before his Father* Johanan *came to be High Prieſt, (at which time I conceive with good ground that the Book of* Nehemiah *was written,) and yet* Jaddus *might be mentioned as he is in that Book; but I ſuppoſed him born thirty years before, in compliance with the moſt learned Primate, who reckons that* Jaddus *might be about* 83 *years old at his Death; ſo he judged, by comparing the Scriptures with* Joſephus. *I attribute much to his judgment in theſe Matters; but not to reſt upon that onely, I have alſo conſidered the years of the High Prieſts above mentioned; they are recorded in* Chronicon Paſchale, *but I think better in* Syncellus; *who though he doth not quote his Author, yet is reaſonably preſumed to have tranſcribed them from* Julius Affricanus, *an Author that lived little more than an hundred years after* Joſephus, *and living in the ſame Countrey, might have his Information from them that knew as well as* Joſephus *himſelf,* P. 9.

himself. In placing the years of these Priests, I begin from the Death of Jaddus, *who is said to have dyed about the same time with* Alexander *the Great; reckoning from thence upwards, the Death of* Joiakim *will fall in the* 20th *of* Artaxerxes, *which exactly agrees with the account of his Death I have given from Scripture: And indeed there is nothing said of any of these Priests, either in the holy Scripture or in* Josephus, *but what very well consists with the account of their years given us in this Catalogue. That you may the better judge of this, I have given you a short View of their years, compared with those of the Kings of* Persia, *as they are in* Ptolomy's *Canon.* And then he subjoins the Catalogue, which will be considered presently. In answer to all this I observe,

1. That our Author is mistaken when he says, *there is nothing said of any of these Priests in* Josephus, *but what very well consists with the account of their years in this Catalogue.* For,

(1.) *Josephus* places the beginning of *Eliashib*'s High Priesthood in the Reign of *Xerxes*, and our Author in the Catalogue places it in the 20th of *Artaxerxes*, the Successor of *Xerxes*, which I think is not very consistent, as our Author would make us believe.

(2.) Our Authour makes his Calculation from the times of the High Priesthood of the several High Priests, which is a very doubtfull and uncertain Ground to proceed on, and, if possible, more suspitious than the Story our Author endeavours to prove by it. He indeed intimates, that it was transcribed from *Africanus*, who lived in *Judæa*, and might know as well as *Josephus*; but he hath no proof of this: And he tells us *Syncellus* doth not *quote* his Author, onely it may be *reasonably presumed.* But *Presumptions* are but *Presumptions*, let them be never so *reasonable*, and not sufficient to determine a Man in a Matter of this nature; however, let that account be either *Syncellus*'s own, or *Africanus*'s, or any other's, this I have to say:

(1.) That there is no substantial Ground for the Account it self; the Scripture hath nothing at all of it, nor yet *Josephus*: They name the High Priests indeed, but give no account how long each of them were so. And our Author's Reason is none at all, *That* Africanus *lived in the Countrey of* Judæa, *and might have his Information from them that knew as well as* Josephus *himself*; for though he did live at *Emmaus*, yet he was no native of the Countrey, but an *Africane*, and that is collected to be the reason of his Name, (*Africanus*;) and when he did live there, it was a long time after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, when the Temple was burnt, and the Town sack'd, and by reasonable Presumption (our Author's Argument) all their publick Records burnt or lost, when many Millions of them were killed, infinite Numbers dispersed, especially at the time of *Africanus*, who lived about 140 years after; he was like to receive from a poor remnant an excellent account of the Times of the High Priests, that were 6 or 700 years before. And where is it said in *Syncellus*, that the account that was given of the High Priests, is what was taken by Tradition from the *Jews*? Any Man

that reads *Syncellus* will find it clear other wise, that he adjusts his Chronology of the times of the Priests not by Tradition, or Records, but by Inference and Deduction, as in the Case of *Jeshua*, the first High Priest after the Return from the Captivity; for he plainly argues against some body who had said that *Jeshua* was High Priest 31 years. And he endeavours to prove the contrary; for that Jeshua's *High Priesthood commenced the first of* Cyrus, *according to* Ezra 11. 2. *where he is set in conjunction with* Zerubbabel, *and that* Jeshua *dyed the 20th of* Darius, *and from thence infers, that the Continuance of* Jeshua's *High Priesthood was* 60 *years.* Here is nothing at all of Tradition, or receiving Information from the *Jews*, but an Account made out by chronological Computation, and which Computation is also false: So that this matter of receiving Information of the Inhabitants of *Judea*, is nothing else but our Author's Fancy. However how does this appear, that this account of the High Priests in *Syncellus*, was transcribed out of *Africanus?* That needs another Reason; or what methods will our Author give us to distinguish between what is *Syncellus*'s own, and what is taken out of *Africanus?* A Man must have very good Eyes that can see the difference. *Goar* indeed, the last Editor of *Syncellus*, hath fairly offered at it; but, (1.) No Man will take all his Conjectures for plain Proofs, especially when it concerns a Matter of Practice. And, (2.) *Goar* himself doth not assign the account of the High Priests continuance in their Priesthood to *Africanus*. From all together these two things plainly follow:

Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ἰωσεδὲκ ἀρχιερέα διάχουσα, &c. Syncellus P. 240.

1. That no substantial Reason can be given, that the Account of the High Priests in *Syncellus* was transcribed out of *Africanus*. And,

2. If it were transcribed from *Africanus*, notwithstanding no substantial Reason can be given of the Account it self. And this will yet farther appear, if we consider.

2. The great Variety and Discrepancy that is in all sorts of Authors and Chronologers concerning this very Matter; and as far as my Reading serves, I do not find two who are of any repute, and have made it their business to consider it, that are of the same mind about it. I shall give the Reader a short Scheme, and then draw my Inferences from it.

The Account of the High Priests continuance in their respective Priesthoods, are thus, according to different Authors.

	Syncellus	*Chr. Pasch.*	*Salian*	*Wolphius*	*Mercat.*	*Furcius*	*Genebr.*
1 *Jeshua*	60	32	51	00	28	56	28
2 *Joiakim*	36	30	22	28	48	36	42
3 *Eliashib*	34	40	40	41	21	41	21
4 *Joiada*	36	36	20	25	44	25	24
5 *Johanan*	32	32	40	00	47	24	24
6 *Jaddus*	20	20	41	27	18	27	10

And I could add many more, where there is the ſame or a greater diſagreement, but this is ſufficient to ſhew what an excellent Method our Author hath taken, to prove the truth of a ſuſpitious Story, by a *Medium* that is every way as ſuſpitious as the Story it ſelf. And the Truth is, any Man that is converſant in theſe kind of Studies, will plainly perceive, becauſe there is no certain account of theſe things, that all Authors have taken a liberty, and have varied the times of theſe High Prieſts, and have made them more or leſs, according as it might ſerve their reſpective *Hypotheſes*, and might reconcile them to the reſpective Computations of Chronology they thought moſt reaſonable. But this it ſeems our Author thought moſt for his purpoſe, he is for clearing the Difficulties of a Story by Proofs as difficult as the Story it ſelf. And therefore before he had gone any farther, he ought to have proved that *Syncellus*'s Account of the times of thoſe High Prieſts, is a true Account, and which we ought to rely on, againſt all Mankind; and he may yet prove it if he can; and if he could prove it, it would plainly deſtroy all his Book, as we ſhall ſee preſently. In the mean time,

3. Our Author hath not onely pitch'd upon ſuch a precarious Proof as the time of the High Prieſts reſpectively before mentioned, but has arbitrarily, and of his own head, fixed and determined the times of thoſe High Prieſts to certain Kings of *Perſia*, without any manner of Proof and Authority. He takes the times of the High Prieſts out of *Chronicon Paſchale*, or, as he ſays, *better* out of *Syncellus*; and then to make up his Computation, he *compares them with the Kings of* Perſia *in* Ptolomy's *Canon*, although *Ptolomy*'s Canon takes no notice of the High Prieſts, nor yet do the Authors from whom he takes the Account of the High Prieſts, take notice of *Ptolomy*'s Canon; and which is yet more, nor do they place the reſpective High Prieſts as our Author hath placed them, according to *Ptolomy*'s Canon; and to ſhew our Author's excellent way of proving things, I ſhall give the Reader the Schemes before him.

Our Author's Account.

Years before Chriſt.		
445	In Niſan *Nehemiah* came to *Jeruſalem*. After his coming *Joiakim* dyes.	
444	His Son *Eliaſhib* High Prieſt	34 y.
424	*Darius Nothus*	19
410	*Joiada*	36
405	*Jaddus* born. *Artaxerxes Mnemon*	46
374	*Johanan*	32
	In *Johanan*'s time *Bagoſes* Governor.	
359	*Ochus*	21
342	*Jaddus*	20
338	*Arſes*	02

Account in *Chr. Paſch.* p. 142, to 146.

Olympiads.		Years.
70	*Xerxes*	38
71	*Joiakim* High Prieſt	30
77	*Artaxerxes Longimanus*	41
78	*Eliaſhib* High Prieſt	40
87	*Darius Nothus*	19
88	*Joiada* High Prieſt.	16
92	*Sogdianus*	07
94	*Artaxerxes Mnemon*	40
97	*Jannæus* High Prieſt	32
104	*Ochus*	28
105	*Jaddus*	20
110	*Onias*, Son of *Jaddus*,	21

336 *Da-*

336	*Darius Codomanus*	4 y.
332	*Alexander* takes *Tyre*. *Jeruſalem* ſubmits to him.	
330	*Darius* dyes.	
323	*Alexander* dyes, and *Jaddus*.	
111	*Arſiochus*	4 y.
112	*Darius*	6
113	*Alexander* took *Babylon*, and the *Perſian* Monarchy deſtroyed.	

And now does not any Man ſee how our Author's account and that of the *Chr. Paſch.* do agree? He determines the High Prieſthood of *Jaddus* about the Death of *Alexander*, and the *Chron. Paſch.* determines it in the Reign of *Ochus*; and plainly aſſerts, that not *Jaddus*, but his Son *Onias* was High Prieſt at the latter end of *Ochus*, and during the Reign of *Arſes*, *Codomanus* and *Alexander*; which is as fair a Proof of my Point, as I could deſire. But our Author is for taking the *Prieſts* from one Author, and the *Kings* from another, and then putting them together, as he finds occaſion; which is ſuch a way of proving things as is not ordinary to be met with. And at this rate he may, if he pleaſe, make Archbiſhop *Cranmer* contemporary with *William* the Conquerour. But if it was allowed him, it will by no means ſerve his turn; for I defie any Man, that can but tell an hundred, who by comparing theſe High Prieſts in the *Chron. Paſch.* and *Syncellus*, with the Kings of *Perſia* in *Ptolomy*'s *Canon*, can make the time of *Jaddus* Prieſthood contemporary with *Alexander*. And for the clear manifeſtation of this, I ſhall ſet and compare them together.

	High Prieſts in	
	Chr. Paſch.	Syncellus.
1 *Jeſhua*	32	60
2 *Joiakim*	30	36
3 *Eliaſhib*	40	34
4 *Joiada*	36	36
5 *Johanan*	32	32
6 *Jaddus*	20	20
	190	218

Kings in *Ptolomy*'s Canon.	
Cyrus	09
Cambyſes	08
Darius primus	36
Xerxes	21
Artaxerxes primus	41
Darius ſecundus	19
Artaxerxes ſecundus	46
Ochus	21
Arſes	02
Darius tertius	04
	207
After theſe *Alexander* the Great	08
	215.

Now to ſtate theſe Accounts exactly here are two things to be obſerved:

1. As to the Time of *Cyrus* his Reign, whether it is to be computed from the time of his being fully poſſeſſed of the whole *Perſian* Empire, and alſo as to his making the Edict to releaſe the Jews in Captivity. But as to that Point, it is indifferent to me, let our Author, or any Man elſe, take what time they pleaſe for it, the Scripture ſays it was the firſt of *Cyrus*, and let that

that *first* be dated at what time they please of his Reign, tis all one in the present Case, I had before, by the modestest Computation I could make, assigned 3 years before his death; and if our Author does not like that, he may assign it 2 or 1 year before. It is certain it was some time before, and if but 2 years before, the Computation will stand thus: That the whole time of the *Persian* Monarchy, or from the time of the Edict of *Cyrus*, and the Return of the *Jews* from Captivity to the last of *Darius*, is 201; and *Alexander*'s 8 years Reign being added to it, is 209. And this, if I mistake not, is a Concession more than needs, and I believe more than our Author can demand: but at present suppose it, and it will doe him no service; for,

2. The next thing to be observed is concerning the Account of *Syncellus*, which first is manifestly false; for he attributes to *Jeshua* 60 years, to his Son *Joiakim* 36. Now according to the Account of *Cyrus*'s Reign, or Edict to restore the *Jews*, (which according to *Syncellus* is contemporary with the beginning of *Jeshua*'s Priesthood,) then if this Edict was but two years before his Death, *Joiakim*'s Priesthood must determine, and he must dye the 29th of *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, when according to the Scripture, and to our Author himself, his Son *Eliashib* was High Priest the 20th of the same *Artaxerxes*. And therefore, 2. *Syncellus*'s Mistake plainly arose from confounding the first year of *Cyrus*'s Principality, with the first year according to Scripture Account, which is generally supposed to respect not the first year of his Principality, but the first year of his Monarchy over *Persia*. But be that as it will, 'tis all one; for *Syncellus* attributing to *Cyrus* 31 years, and for that Reason reckoning the High Priesthood of *Jeshua*, as contemporary and concurrent with it, it comes all to the same purpose; and if we reckon according to *Syncellus*, instead of computing from two years before *Cyrus*'s Death, we must compute from 31; and this brings the Matter to the same Issue, and according to that Compute, *Jaddus*'s High Priesthood must determine in the days of *Ochus*, and not in the time of *Alexander*: And accordingly *Syncellus* plainly asserts, 3. That *Jeshua*'s High Priesthood did determine the 20th of *Darius*; and then according to that Calculation *Jaddus* his Priesthood must determine in the time of *Ochus*, and 20 years before the Death of *Alexander*, according to *Ptolomy*'s Canon. And now let us compare these Accounts, and see whether it be possible for any man taking the Accounts of the High Priests from *Chronicon Paschale* and *Syncellus*, to make *Jaddus* living at the time of *Alexander*.

The whole Account of the times of these High Priests, according to *Chr. Pasch.* is ——— 190 y.

The whole time of the *Persian* Kings, supposing *Cyrus* but the 2d before his Death to the last of *Codomanus*, is 200, and to the Death of *Alexander* 8 more, in *Ptolomy*'s Canon, is ——— 208 y.

That is, that by comparing the account of the High Priests in *Chronicon Paschale* with the *Persian* Kings in *Ptolomy*'s Canon, it plainly appears, that

Jaddus

Jaddus dyed in the time of *Ochus*, and that his Son *Onias*, and not he, was High Prieſt at the time of *Alexander*; and according to the loweſt Computation there is 18 years difference between our Author when he compares them, and what is the true Computation according to that *Chronicon*.

And then for *Syncellus*, from the beginning of *Joiakim*'s High Prieſthood (the 20th of *Darius*) to the laſt of *Jaddus*, is ——————— 158 y.

From the 20th of *Darius* to the laſt of *Codomanus*, in *Ptolomy*'s Canon, is 170, and adding the 8 of *Alexander*, is ——————— 178 y.

And therefore by comparing the High Prieſts in *Syncellus* with the *Perſian* Kings in *Ptolomy*'s Canon, it plainly appears, that our Author's Computation is but a Miſtake of 20 years, even as much as the whole time of *Jaddus*'s High Prieſthood. And it does as plainly appear that *Jaddus*'s Prieſthood determined in the Reign of *Ochus*, and not in the time of *Alexander*, and much leſs, as our Author aſſigns, about the time of his Death.

And ſo our Author hath prov'd the Matter on my ſide, a great deal better than I could do, or had ſo much as attempted: Alas! I onely argued that the Story was *ſuſpitious*; but our Author gives us Evidence and Demonſtration, that it is not true, nor can be; for if he will ſtand by his own Method, and compare the Account of the Times of theſe High Prieſts, as they are in *Chron. Paſch.* and *Syncellus*, with the account of the *Perſian* Kings in *Ptolomy*'s Canon. 'Tis as plain as the Sun, that *Jaddus*'s High Prieſthood ended ſome years before *Alexander*'s Expedition into *Perſia*, and therefore was not alive when *Alexander* beſieged *Tyre*; and conſequently *Joſephus*'s Story concerning *Jaddus* and *Alexander* cannot be true; which I confeſs is a better Proof for my Aſſertion, than any I have offered at. This therefore deſerves Thanks and due Acknowledgment, and which by theſe Preſents I return to our Author. And if he had been pleaſed to vindicate Dr. *Sherlock* as he hath vindicated *Joſephus*, he would have obliged me for ever; for then I do not queſtion but Dr. *Sherlock* would have been anſwered much better than I have done.

Our Author now comes to conſider the Ages of *Sanballat* and *Manaſſes*, and tells us, *For the firſt of theſe he is ſpoken of by* Joſephus, *with that Care which one would have thought might have prevented this Objection*; and yet however it comes to paſs, moſt Men that have well conſidered it have made this Objection, and never thought that the Care and Caution of *Joſephus*'s expreſſing it, would ſo eaſily take it off: And for any thing I know Dr. *Iſaac Voſſius* was the firſt who thought of the Anſwer our Author hath given to it, and our Author I ſuppoſe out of him: And it was abſolutely neceſſary for him to find out ſome expedient for this; for otherwiſe his Chronology would have been one of the wildeſt things in the World; for he places *Nehemiah*'s going up to *Jeruſalem* as *Joſephus* does, in the Reign of *Xerxes*; and then if *Sanballat*, that diſturbed *Nehemiah*, had lived to *Alexander*'s taking of *Tyre*, he muſt have been 185 years old; nay, according to his account, 220 years p. 11.

old; for he alligns to the Reign of *Artaxerxes Mnemon* 62 years, and makes the Continuance of the *Persian* Monarchy to be 253 years: And therefore to solve this Objection, which lay so obvious against him, he found out this Answer, and tells us as our Author does, That there were two *Sanballats*; one the *Horonite*, mentioned by *Nehemiah*; the other sent into *Samaria* by *Codomanus*. But he gives no Proof of this, but onely the account of *Josephus*: But that signifies nothing in the present Controversie; for *Josephus* saying that *Sanballat* was sent by *Darius*, who was driven out by *Alexander*, if it appears that *Sanballat* was *Prefect* of *Syria* upon the coming of *Nehemiah* to *Jerusalem*, which is the Scripture account, and the Ground of the Objection, and can never be answered by *Josephus*'s saying *Sanballat* was sent by *Darius*, who was beaten by *Alexander*; for the Question is, whether there were two; and *Josephus* mentioning onely one, is not an Argument that there were two, but a reason that he hath misplaced that one that he mentions. The Scriptures mention but one *Sanballat*, and *Josephus* likewise telling the same Story with the Scriptures, mentions but one *Sanballat*, though he has placed his *Sanballat* many years after the Scripture account. The Station is the same, as Prefect of *Syria*, both in the Scripture, and in *Josephus*; and this I think a fair Reason, that the *Sanballats* in the Scripture, and in *Josephus* are but one, though the placing of them are different, and which is the Ground of the *Objection*. Our Author farther adds, (which *Vossius* never thought on,) and makes it the Ground of his Answer, the Difference between *Horonaim* and *Chutha*; and because the Scripture calls *Sanballat* the *Horonite*, and *Josephus* calls his *Sanballat* a *Chuthæan*; therefore our Author concludes they must not be the same *Sanballat*, because of their different Original and Extraction, and says, *Who would have thought that this* Chuthæan *should have been mistaken for the* Moabite *of* Horonaim, *whom* Nehemiah *found in* Palestine 100 *years before*; and then takes some pains to prove that *Horonaim* was in *Moab*, and that *Nehemiah*'s *Sanballat* was a *Moabite*. And what does that signifie? For besides that the Distinction of such additional Names and Characters is a very slender Proof of the Distinction of the Persons; for Men may have such additional Characters upon several accounts, and there are Instances enough of it in Scripture. However here are two things considerable.

1. The Question is, whether there were in those respective Times two *Sanballats*, and to say that *Josephus*, who writes the same Story, and mentions but one, calls his a *Chuthæan*, and therefore he is not the same, is answering by the Question; for why may not *Josephus* be mistaken as well in the Pedigree, as he is in the times of *Sanballat*? But suppose he is not, and hath given his Extraction right,

2. Why might not the *Chuthæans* (at least some of them) be translated to *Moab*, upon the Conquest of that Country, as well as to *Samaria* upon the Conquest of that; this was usual in the Eastern Conquests, to transplant their

their own People, and remove the Natives, (and the Case of *Samaria* is sufficient proof of it;) and then *Sanballat* might be called an *Horonite* with respect to his Birth and last Habitation in the Scripture, and *Josephus* might call him a *Chuthæan* with respect to the Nation or People from whom he was descended. This is usual in *Josephus*, especially with respect to them, who calls the *Samaritanes Chuthæans*, though they had lived in *Samaria* for several Generations. He calls them so in *Alexander*'s time, which was about 400 years after their Planting there; and he does so often afterwards when he is angry, tho' he wrote his Book near 800 years after their being settled in that Country; which is just to as much purpose as to call Englishmen *Saxons*, *Danes*, or *Normans*. And I wonder why he might not for the same reason call *Sanballat* a *Chuthæan*, though neither he nor any of his Ancestors for five or six Generations had ever seen that Countrey. And *Josephus* himself plainly favours this, for all that he says is, that he was of the *Race* of the *Chuthæans*, *from which the* Samaritanes *came*; and which he might be well enough, and yet a *Horonite* by Birth, and his Ancestors might have been Inhabitants of *Moab* for some Generations. And the same angry reason which made him generally call the *Samaritanes Chuthæans*, might make him say the same of *Sanballat*, though he might come no more immediately from *Chutha* than the *Samaritanes* themselves.

However the Force of the Objection does not lie in the Names being the same, which yet is more than our Author can fairly answer; but that join'd with other considerable Circumstances. There is not onely an Identity of Name, but of several other material Things. The *Sanballat* in Scripture, and the *Sanballat* in *Josephus* was Prefect of *Syria*, and had a Daughter married to the Son of the High Priest, who was obstinate, and would not forsake his forbidden Marriage, and for which he was deprived of his Priesthood. These are the Characters of the Case of *Sanballat* in the Scriptures, and they are the very same of *Josephus*'s *Sanballat*; and where there is both the same Name, and also a harmony of such and so many extraordinary Circumstances, to dispute whether they are the same Person, is to strain upon the Ingenuity and common Reason of Mankind. I had told him before, Answ. p. 91.
"Such a Concurrence of all Circumstances, is like the Platonick year, and "is not likely to return sooner; or if such a strange thing should happen, "is it probable that all Histories would have been silent of it? But of this our Author takes no manner of Notice, but talks of the strangeness that *there should be two of a Name*, (as if the Objection consisted in that;) and then he takes some pains to prove that there may be two Persons of the same Name, and tells me, *it would not have stuck with me, if I had considered that there were two* Artaxerxes, and some others he there mentions; and then gravely concludes, *There's no strangeness in this; but that any Man should be so senseless, to think these two Pairs* (he mentions) *were but one Man each*, — P. 12.
Now I grant our Author, that it is *senseless* to think that two Persons may not

not have the ſame Name; but withall it is a little *ſenſeleſs* too to pretend to anſwer an Objection, and yet never conſider that wherein it conſiſts. There might be two *Sanballats*, as well as two *Artaxerxes*, (tho' not ſo eaſie neither, if it was as our Author would have it, of two ſuch differing Countries and Originals as *Chutha* and *Moab*;) but that each of theſe *Sanballats* ſhould be a Lieutenant in the ſame Country, that each of them ſhould have a Daughter, that each of theſe Daughters ſhould be married to a Son of the High Prieſt, againſt the Laws of their Countrey, that each of theſe Sons ſhould be obſtinate, and perſiſt in ſuch unlawfull Wedlock, and for which each of them was deprived of his Prieſthood, and of all Honour in his own Countrey: And with our Author's good leave, theſe I ſuppoſe are not Matters of ſuch ordinary Occurrence, as having two Men of the ſame Name; and for my part I can liken it to nothing elſe than as I have already, to the *Platonick* Year. And ſuch a Conjunction of all Circumſtances is likely to fall out, when the *Platonick* Revolution ſhall have ſet every thing in the ſame Order, Place, and Station as it was before.

Laſtly, Our Author comes to conſider the Age of *Manaſſes*, Brother of *Jaddus*, and here he ſaith, *The Objector, to find a Fault in this Story, makes many. For firſt he confounds this Brother of* Jaddus *with his Uncle, that is mentioned by* Nehemiah *in the end of his Book*, Nehemiah *there calleth him*, one of the Sons of *Joiada*, the Son of *Eliaſhib* the High Prieſt; *which is plain enough to ſhew, that he was younger Brother of* Johanan, *the Father of* Jaddus. Now I own that I take *Manaſſes* to be the ſame that is mentioned by *Nehemiah*. I own likewiſe that *Nehemiah* does not call him the Brother of *Jaddus*, but *one of the Sons of* Joiada: But has our Author forgot what he ſays about the *common way of ſhortening Pedigrees* in the Caſe of *Ezra*? and tells me farthermore, that the want of conſidering it run me into that Difficulty of *Ezra*'s Age, and particularly inſtances in this very Book of *Nehemiah*, where *Johanan* is called the Son of *Eliaſhib*, who indeed was his Grandfather, and his immediate Father was *Joiada*: And why, I wonder, will not this ſerve in the preſent Caſe, and when it is ſaid *one of the Sons of* Joiada, it may be underſtood that he was his *Grandſon*, and not his immediate Son, as is very uſual, both in this Book, and in other places of Scripture, (as our Author has obſerved, though I think not ſo pertinently applied to the Caſe of *Ezra*, for the Reaſons before.) But notwithſtanding this Anſwer of our Author himſelf, he tells me very magiſterially, *No matter for that, the Objector to make* Joſephus *a Lyar, makes bold with the Scripture it ſelf*. And what is this *Boldneſs*, I pray? Why truly, ſuppoſing that when the Scripture calls ſuch a Perſon the Son of another, he may be the Grandſon, and not the Son in propriety of Speech. And if this be to *make bold* with Scripture, 'tis what is very allowable; and our Author hath the leaſt reaſon to charge me with it, who uſes the very ſame *boldneſs*, and inſiſts upon it, and intimates me guilty of Inconſiderateneſs for not minding it. This therefore is a plain

Ch. 13. 28.

P. 5.

Neh. 12. 23.

Anſwer

Anſwer to what our Author here cites out of *Nehemiah*, and he that is call'd one of the Sons of *Joiada*, might notwithſtanding be the immediate Son of *Johanan*; *i. e.* he might be *Manaſſes*, whom *Joſephus* mentions. And as there is no reaſon, ſo our Author being conſiſtent with himſelf, can never except againſt it. But I have one thing more to obſerve, and that is,

That there is all the Reaſon in the World to conclude, even from *Joſephus* himſelf, that he who is mentioned in *Nehemiah*, as marrying the Daughter of *Sanballat*, could be no other than *Manaſſes*, the Brother of *Jaddus*, though at the ſame time it will appear, that he hath miſplaced them, as to the time of it. Now *Joſephus* in his Eleventh Book of *Antiquities*, undertakes to give account of the Affairs of the *Jews*, during the *Perſian* Monarchy, and among other obſervable things, he particularly takes notice of *Nehemiah*, and of matters relating to the time of his Government; but not one ſingle word either of *Sanballat*, or of any Marriage of the High Prieſt's Son or Grandſon with his Daughter, or of any ſuch Marriage at all. He likewiſe particularly takes notice of *Jeſus* the Son of *Joiada*, of his Friendſhip with *Bagoſes*, and by whoſe aſſiſtance he hoped to gain the High Prieſthood; and laſtly of his Death, being killed by his elder Brother *Johanan* in the Temple; but not the leaſt Intimation of his Marrying with the Daughter of *Sanballat*, nor any thing like it: And all that *Joſephus* does mention, with reſpect to that Matter, is, That *Sanballat* was Governour of *Syria*, and ſent by *Darius*, who was conquered by *Alexander*; and that *Manaſſes*, the Brother of *Jaddus*, married his Daughter, and for which he was expelled by *Jaddus*. From whence 'tis very plain. Ch. 5. Ch. 7.

(1.) That there is not the leaſt Foot-ſtep in *Joſephus* for two *Sanballat*'s being Prefects of *Syria*, at two differing times.

(2.) That *Joſephus* takes no manner of notice of two Marriages of the High Prieſt's Son with the Daughter of a Governour of *Syria*, but onely of one.

(3.) That this one is the Marriage of *Manaſſes*, the Brother of *Jaddus*, to the Daughter of *Sanballat*, Governour of *Syria*. And therefore,

(4.) As to the Matter the Scripture account and *Joſephus*'s perfectly agree, *Joſephus* indeed hath added the Name of the Man, (*Manaſſes*,) and of the Woman, (*Nicaſo*,) in which the Scripture is ſilent.

And therefore I will appeal to any unprejudiced and impartial Reader, whether, fairly laying things together, he can poſſibly believe, that this account in *Joſephus* was not deſigned for the ſame account we have in *Nehemiah*, onely he hath miſtimed it; for *Joſephus* all along giving us the account of Scripture, (and which he himſelf intimates,) if there were two *Sanballats*, why did he not name them? If two ſuch Marriages,

how came he to omit them? But if there was but onely one, (and he muſt have good Eyes that can find any more in *Joſephus*, then it is plain that *Joſephus* is miſtaken, and the Queſtion is, whether the Scripture account is to regulate *Joſephus*, or *Joſephus*'s account to regulate the Scripture, and which will require no difficulty to determine.

P. 13. Our Author adds, *But* Joſephus *knew what he writ, as appears by his fixing the time of this Story. There was no date of Time better known among the* Jews, *than that of the Building their Temple at* Jeruſalem; *nor among the* Samaritanes, *than that of the Building the Temple of* Girizim. *They remembred nothing more than the Deſtruction of their Temples; and no doubt if they had any Records, or any Hiſtories, the times of theſe things were chiefly remembred in them: But it was within* 200 *years of* Joſephus's *time that the Temple at Mount* Girizim *was deſtroyed by* Johannes Hircanus, *it happened at a memorable time, ſoon after the Death of* Antiochus Pius, *(which was in the year before Chriſt* 130,) *then that Temple was deſtroyed, ſaith* Joſephus, *200 years after the building of it. How long that Temple ſtood none knew better than the* Samaritanes *themſelves. And as they were Enemies to the* Jews, *ſo they muſt be particularly to that* Author, *who provokes them as oft as he mentioneth them; How then durſt he have put it into their power to diſprove him? I take it therefore for certain, by their account as well as his, (accounting* 200 *years upwards from the Deſtruction,) that their Temple was built in the year before Chriſt* 430, (it ſhould be 330,) *which falls in the time of* Alexander *the Great; and not as the Objector would have it, in the time of* Artaxerxes Longimanus.

Antiq. l. 13. c. 17.

But, 1. Where does our Authour find, that *I would have it*, that the Temple of *Girizim* was *built in the time of* Longimanus? I ſay no ſuch thing, nor was there any need of it. I quote indeed the *Jewiſh* Chronologers, who affirm it was built long before the times of *Alexander*; but I do but barely quote it, and draw no Argument from it; or if I had, it would not follow, that therefore I would have it built in the time of *Longimanus*, nor does it follow from any thing I ſay; for ſuppoſe *Sanballat* built the Temple for his Son-in-law, that might very well be, and it could not reaſonably be otherwiſe than ſeveral years after *Longimanus*. But,

2. Our Author tells us, *Joſephus* fixes this Story at a time *well known*, as the Building the Temple, *no date of time better* known among the *Jews than the building the Temple at* Jeruſalem, *nor among the* Samaritanes, *than the building the Temple of* Girizim. But I pray was not likewiſe the coming up of *Nehemiah* to *Jeruſalem*, and building the Walls of it, and filling it with Inhabitants, a date of time alſo well known? And *no doubt* (as our Author argues) *if they had any Records, or any Hiſtories, the times of theſe things were chiefly remembred in them.* But for all that *Joſephus* fixes the time of that in the Reign of *Xerxes*, which is contrary to our Author's

Author's own account, who fixes it in the Reign of his Succeſſour: So that for any thing I can ſee, the date of time well known, is no ſecurity againſt Errour and Miſtake; and I ſuppoſe there was as much Reaſon for *Joſephus* to know the date of the Building the Walls of *Jeruſalem*, as of a Temple in *Samaria*. But this concerned the Affairs of his own Countrey, in which there was no need to be ſo exact; for his Countrymen and Friends would not be ſo ready to find fault: For our Author tells us, *the* Samaritanes *were Enemies to the* Jews, *and particularly to* Joſephus; *and how* durſt *he put it in their power to diſprove him.* As if a Man who *durſt* miſtake in the Affairs of his own Countrey, *durſt* not alſo miſtake in thoſe of his Neighbours; there is reaſon indeed that a Man ſhould not tell that for truth which is not; but if Men are miſtaken, and take one thing or time for another, I think there is no need to prove that Men are not affraid to publiſh theſe Miſtakes, let them concern either Friend or Foe. But our Author confirms his Point, *The* Samaritans *would certainly diſprove him, if this had not been true; and therefore I take it for certain by their account, as well as his.* But,

(1.) How does our Author know whether they did diſprove him or no, has he any *Samaritane* Authors that wrote about thoſe Times? And methinks he that will not admit the *Silence* of *Heathen* Hiſtorians to be a Proof concerning a Matter that mightily related to their Hiſtory, cannot himſelf conclude from the Silence of *Samaritane* Writers, and eſpecially when there are no ſuch Writers to be found.

(2.) The Diſpute between the *Jews* and *Samaritanes* was not concerning the building or deſtroying their Temple, but concerning their Worſhip, or the Place of it, but not the Structure; and it made no manner of difference as to that, whether their Temple was built at the time of *Alexander*, or 100 years before. *Joſephus* tells a Story of a Conteſt between the *Jews* and *Samaritanes* at *Alexandria* concerning their Worſhip, and which came to be debated before *Ptolomy* by Advocates on each ſide; and he that undertook the Cauſe of the *Jews*, proved the Holineſs of the Temple from the Law; and by a continued Succeſſion of High Prieſts, and the propagation of the Prieſthood to that very time, and the Honours and Gifts conferred on that Temple by the Kings of *Aſia*; but not a word which of the Temples was firſt built, or inſiſting upon the late building of the Temple of *Girizim*. So that it ſeems let that be ſooner or later, it made no difference in the Queſtion. And it is plain enough the Diſpute and Schiſm laſted after the Temple of *Girizim* was deſtroyed, nay, after both the Temples were deſtroyed; it was not therefore either the Building or the Deſtruction of the Temple was matter of Diſpute between them: And ſo with reſpect to the time of that, (which is the Matter now before us,) if our Author could find they had not diſproved *Joſephus* in that, it would not ſignifie much, there

Antiq. l. 13.

there being no great need to be ſo very critical in that which was not the main point in Controverſie, and whether it was built or deſtroyed 100 years before or after, it was all one in reſpect of that; nay, if our Author could find that they had diſproved *Joſephus* in this, it would have ſignified nothing neither; for our Author hath a ſmall Argument that would wipe out the Teſtimony of all the *Samaritanes* in the World; for who knows not that the *Samaritanes* hated the *Jews*, and had a particular Quarrel againſt *Joſephus*, for talking ſuch hard things of them? And therefore though our Author brings their not diſproving *Joſephus* as an Argument to confirm what he ſays, it is plain enough, that if they had diſproved him a thouſand times over, it would ſignifie nothing at all by our Author's way of arguing.

3. Our Authour proves the Temple of *Girizim* muſt be built in the time of *Alexander*, by calculating from the Deſtruction of it, which, according to *Joſephus*, was 200 *years after the building of it*; and that being ſoon after *Antiochus Pius*'s Death, which was 130 years before Chriſt, reckoning upwards, the Building of it will fall in 330 before Chriſt, which is the time of *Alexander*. But,

(1.) Suppoſe it: What is that to the Controverſie between us, which is not concerning the Building of that Temple, but the Age of *Sanballat?* I have no Diſpute with him about that; let it be built when he pleaſes, it is all one to me; but if he will needs have *Sanballat* to build it, as *Joſephus* affirms, I doubt it muſt be built before *Alexander*'s time.

(2.) Suppoſe *Joſephus* ſays this; why then this proves, that *Joſephus* in this point is conſiſtent with himſelf; but this does not prove but that he may be out in his Account, which is the onely Queſtion, from the time of *Alexander* to the Death of *Antiochus Pius*, is ſuppoſe 200 years, and ſo far *Joſephus* reckons right; but if the ground of this Calculation be wrong, how equally ſoever he may reckon from thence, the whole is a Miſtake. He had placed the building of this Temple in the Time of *Alexander*, and ſpeaking of the Deſtruction of it 200 years after, he could not, without contradicting himſelf, ſay otherwiſe. And the utmoſt that this proves is, that *Joſephus* did not contradict himſelf. *Joſephus* in the ſame place ſaith, it was built *by the Permiſſion of* Alexander, and refers to what he had ſaid of it before, and it is every jot as good an Argument to prove the Temple was built *by the Permiſſion of* Alexander, becauſe he mentions it again in another place of the ſame Book. This proves indeed that *Joſephus* did not forget himſelf; but proves the Point no more than if he had ſaid it onely once: For the ſecond Aſſertion is of no more Validity and Authority than the firſt, and eſpecially when the firſt is plainly and particularly referred to; as if *Joſephus* his Authority concerning the ſame thing, was more cogent in his *Thirteenth* than it is in his *Eleventh* Book.

With

With reſpect to this matter, our Author adds, *He tells us from* David Ganz, *that the* Jewiſh *Chronologers affirm, that the Temple on Mount* Girizim *was built long before the time of* Alexander, *and that at the time of* Alexander, Simeon Juſtus *was High Prieſt, and which* Simeon *was Grand-ſon of* Jaddus. And to this our Author adds out of the next Page, *The Objector tells us afterwards that* Calviſius, *and not only he, but all Chronologers find* Joſephus's *Errors and Miſtakes concerning thoſe times, ſo many and ſo groſs, as would make any man that acted upon Principles of Sincerity very fearful to uſe an Example taken out of him in matters of Practice.* Now I do not know for what purpoſe our Author added this laſt Citation here (for it does not concern the immediate matter our Author argues againſt, nor was it uſed by me with reference either to the building of the Temple of *Girizim*, or to the *Jewiſh* Chronologers, but a general Inference from the whole,) except it was for an Introduction to the Reflection that follows. Answ. p. 10.

I believe (ſays he) *the Objector* acts upon Principles of Sincerity *in other things, notwithſtanding that he ſeems to forget them in his Quotations: In theſe I muſt needs ſay, he gives great ſuſpicion of the contrary, by omitting thoſe words that make againſt him in his own Authors. Of which I ſhall give a clear proof by and by.* And when our Author does give that, we ſhall ſee whether there is from thence any reaſon for ſuch *great ſuſpicion of my Sincerity in my Quotations.* P. 14.

What our Author adds, about excepting *all the beſt of Chronologers* from among thoſe who find fault with *Joſephus*, I ſhall conſider preſently, in the mean time with reſpect to the Citation out of *Ganz* he tells us.

I allow him the Jewiſh *Chronologers, who are as much the Enemies of* Joſephus *as he himſelf, for they have the like quarrel againſt him, becauſe he breaks all their meaſures.* Well, I perceive, tho *Joſephus* was ſomewhat unfortunate, in having ſo many people find fault with him, yet he is mighty happy in an Advocate, who will be ſure to find out ſome oblique reaſon or other, to lay all the blame upon them. But I wonder which way our Author will *vindicate Joſephus* from himſelf; ſuch Characters may ſerve well enough for *Heathens, Jews*, and the Anſwerer; and *Malice, Enmity*, and *particular Quarrels*, may be a reaſon ſufficient againſt them. But what I pray is the Reaſon of the *Vindicator's* Contradicting of *Joſephus*: *Joſephus* as much *breaks our Authors Meaſures* as mine, and if he can reconcile his own Chronology with *Joſephus*, I will give him the Cauſe. And let our Author try what a pure Anſwer this would be, in the differing Account he gives from *Joſephus*, and I do not know any reaſon, but it may be as good an Anſwer for him, with reſpect to the points in which he differs from *Joſephus*, as it is for me, with reſpect to thoſe, in which I differ from him.

Well! how liberal ſoever the Author was but juſt before to *allow* me the *Jewiſh* Chronologers, becauſe he thinks them not worth much; yet for all that he will not *allow* me *them* neither: for it follows, *But yet the* Jewiſh *Chronologers will not help the Objector in his Cauſe. They will not make* Jaddus *live to one hundred and twenty four years of age, and* Sanballat *to one hundred and forty five.* Nor did I quote them for any ſuch thing, but for ſomething elſe as we ſhall ſee preſently. In the mean time his Reaſon is, *They are ſo far from that, that they ſcarce allow either of them any age, for they make the* * *whole time of the ſecond Temple at* Jeruſalem *till the ſixth of* Alexander *the Great to be but thirty four years.* And what if they do? does it follow therefore, that they will not allow *Sanballat* or *Jaddus* ſcarce any age? *Ganz* himſelf in anſwering an Objection out of *Meor Enajim* concerning this very matter, and to make good his Compute, ſuppoſes the High Prieſts to have Children at eighteen or twenty, and then ſuppoſes that upon the Return out of *Babylon*, *Jeſhua* might be a hundred, at the ſame time *Joakim* eighty, *Eliaſhib* ſixty, *Joiadah* forty, *Johanan* twenty, and *Jadduah* juſt born then; and then concludes, if *Simeon Juſtus* were *Jaddua* he muſt be thirty five, at the time of *Alexander*, if *Simeon Juſtus* was the eighth from *Jeſhua*, (*i. e.*) the Grandſon of *Jaddus*, then it is but ſuppoſing they had Children at eighteen, and then there would be time ſufficient. Now this how wild ſoever it be, yet ſhews that they were not for allowing them ſcarce any age, when *Ganz* himſelf hath taken ſuch mighty pains to *make* them ſome: and, as I take it, the aſſigning *Jaddus* expreſly thirty five years at the time of *Alexander*, is not *ſcarcely allowing him any age.* And this by the way is in the very Page that our Author quotes, *viz. pag.* 64. Our Author adds, *In that ſixth year of* Alexander, *they ſay that he came up againſt* Jeruſalem, *and that* Jaddus (Ganz *ſays* Simeon Juſtus) *the High Prieſt, and all the Elders of* Iſrael *came forth to him, and that they made a Covenant with* Alexander (*tho* Darius *was then living.*) And yet *Ganz* has not the leaſt ſyllable of Darius *being then living.* But as it happens, the very Page before, and but five Lines before he ſpeaks of *Simeon Juſtus*, he plainly and in expreſs Terms ſays, that he (*Darius*) *was ſlain.* And is not this a pure *Vindicator* of *Authors*, who deals thus with them? And, which is yet more pleaſant, he inſinuates the ſame Fault upon me, when 'tis only his own; for theſe are his next Words: *This Story* (ſays he) *fills up moſt of that very Page our Objector quotes in his Margent.* Well, that is true; but there is this difference, that the High Prieſt there is called *Simeon Juſtus*, and our Author calls him *Jaddus*, but for that our Author ſays, *he might have ſeen in the paſſage before, where* Ganz *tell us of* Simeon the Juſt, *that his name was* Jadduah. And that is true too, that he

* *Ganz*, P. 57, 64.

P. 64.

Alexander — aſcendit contra Darium, & expulit illum è terrâ ſuâ, atque interfectus eſt, Ganz, p. 58.

Pag. 57.

he ſays ſo; and this brings us to the point before us. *Ganz* makes the whole time of the *Perſian* Monarchy very ſhort, about ſixty and odd years: and at the end of it makes *Simeon Juſtus* the Son of *Jeſhua* High Prieſt, and calls him *Jadduah*, which is plainly falſe; for *Simeon Juſtus* was Son of *Onias*, and Grandſon of *Jaddus*. And therefore againſt his ſhort Computation, he raiſes an Objection out of other *Jewiſh* Chronologers, particularly out of the Author of *Meor Enajim*, who ſays that *Simeon Juſtus* was the *Eighth* from *Jeſhua*, and proves it partly from *Nehemiah* 12. where it is ſaid, And *Jeſhua* begat *Joiakim*, and *Joiakim* begat *Eliaſhib*, and *Eliaſhib Joiada*, and *Joiada Johanan*, and *Johanan Jaddua*: and partly by Tradition; for it is received, that *Jaddua* begat *Onias*, and *Onias*, *Simeon Juſtus*: and which is certainly true. And the Conſequence of this is, that the times of the *Perſian* Monarchy were much longer than *Ganz* computes them; and which ſeems to be the main reaſon of the Objection as it is repeated by *Ganz*: (for I have not the Author) and which appears further by *Ganz*'s Anſwer, page 63,64. And this was the reaſon of my quoting the *Jewiſh* Chronologers, not for *Ganz*'s Account, which is falſe and ridiculous, but for thoſe other *Jewiſh* Chronologers which he mentions, and who plainly underſtood the Chronology of thoſe Times much better than he did; the Account they give of the Succeſſion of the High Prieſts is undoubtedly true, and what they prove by it, that the *Perſian* Monarchy ſtood much longer than *Ganz* would have it, is certainly true likewiſe; but as far as appears by what *Ganz* cites, they thought *Simeon Juſtus* was High Prieſt at the end of that Monarchy as well as *Ganz*, only he calls him *Jaddua*, when *Jaddua* was his Grandfather, and is plainly proved ſo by them from the Succeſſion of the High Prieſts. Page 58, 59.

Upon the ſame account it was that I quoted *Ganz* for the *Jewiſh* Chronologers concerning the building of the Temple of *Girizim*, *which* our Author tells us, *The Objector ſaith the* Jewiſh *Chronologers affirm to have been built long before* Alexander's *time*. He anſwers, *his* Ganz *tells us, that ſome of their Writers have ſaid ſo, but he diſproves them, and affirms of a certainty, that it was built in* Alexander's *time, and by his permiſſion*. Very well, then *Some of them have ſaid ſo*, and that is as much as I affirmed; but Ganz *himſelf ſays the contrary*, And what if he does? The other ſay contrary to him, and any Man that conſiders what *Ganz* repeats out of them, will find (as I noted before) that what they ſay comes nearer to truth, and conſequently that they are more conſiderable, and are much to be preferred to him: *Ganz* indeed gives a ſtrange account of theſe matters, but the others do not; and how much ſoever our Author may laugh at them, it does not appear that they are ſo very trifling and inconſiderable. But let that be as it will, it plainly appears from hence, that this matter even among them is an intricate Page 51.

and perplexed thing, and the *Jewiſh* Chronologers cannot agree about it. And there are the ſame Debates and Diſputes amongſt them, as there are among others. And this is a pure Account to build a Matter of Practice on, which is the Subject of Contention among all ſorts of Chronologers, and hath no manner either of certainty or perſpicuity in it. Our Author adds, *He* (Ganz) *doth indeed confound the two* Sanballats, *the* Chuthæan, *and the* Horonite, *and makes* Manaſſes *to be the Prieſt that was depoſed in* Nehemiah's *time: this might be excuſed in a* Jew. This is a fine Complement to all the Chronologers almoſt that have wrote concerning theſe times; for excepting *Voſſius* and thoſe that follow him, and our Author, as far as I know, all the reſt, even the Primate himſelf (*whoſe Judgment* our Author *attributes much to*) make no ſuch diſtinction either between *Sanballat* or *Manaſſes*. But it ſeems all that our Author has to ſay for them is, what they ſay *might be excuſed in a* Jew, (And what I pray was *Joſephus?*) *But it is inexcuſable in them.* Well, but our *Author* has a Reaſon: *That reckons that act of* Nehemiah *but four years before the Reign of* Alexander. A very pleaſant Buſineſs, that is to ſay, our Author will excuſe a *Jew*, (and I dare ſay any body elſe) for calling *Nehemiah*'s *Sanballat* the ſame with *Joſephus*'s, provided he will bring him down low enough to fit our Author's purpoſe. But what is this to our Author's Reaſon, The Difference between *Chutha* and *Horonaim?* for if the Reaſon why they are not the ſame be, becauſe they were of diverſe Countries, that Reaſon is all one whether they were Contemporaries, or lived at an hundred years diſtance from each other; and therefore I do not know the force of what follows: *But it is not to be allowed one that reckons one hundred years between.* And why not, I pray, at leaſt as much as a *Jew*, and eſpecially in this matter? for if the difference lie only that the one was a *Horonite*, and the other a *Chuthæan*, the Miſtake is all one with reſpect to that, whether we reckon one, or one hundred years between: he adds, *And takes upon him to correct* Joſephus *by Chriſtian Chronology.* What does our Author mean by this? The *Jewiſh* Chronology he laughs at, and *Chriſtian* Chronology is not for the purpoſe. And therefore *Joſephus*, let him ſay what he pleaſe, is not to be corrected at all; and this, I ſuppoſe, would ſatisfie our Author in this point. But then by what Chronology does our Author *correct* Joſephus? (for he corrects him too.) And if he pleaſe to tell us by what Chronology he does that; it will ſerve my turn well enough, and I will be contented with it. But why *Chriſtian Chronology?* Is Chronology the worſe for being *Chriſtian?* I am afraid this ſame *Chriſtian Chronology* hath ſome *Enmity* or other with *Joſephus, becauſe he breaks all the meaſures of it.* Or elſe our *Author* would have allowed at leaſt as much *excuſe* for it, as he does to a *Jew*. However, the Chronology that I uſe is the Scripture Account,

Pag. 14.

count, and if *Joſephus* cannot be reconciled to that, I think, with our Author's leave, that may *correct* Joſephus, let our Author call it *Chriſtian Chronology*, or what he pleaſe.

But there is one thing more to be taken notice of, and that is, that our Author tells us, *That this Story* (meaning the Story of *Jaddus* and *Alexander*) *fills up moſt of that very page* (in *Ganz*) *that our Objector quotes in the Margent.* Now it is true, there is ſomething of the High Prieſt's going out to *Alexander.* But then *Joſephus*'s Story and this do ſo much differ, that the *Variety* is one Argument more for the *Suſpicion* of it: *Joſephus* calls the High Prieſt *Jaddus*, *Ganz*, *Simeon Juſtus*; *Joſephus* tells us, that upon his adoring the Name of God, and ſaluting the High Prieſt, the Kings of *Syria* and the reſt were aſtoniſhed, and ſcarcely thought him in his right mind, only *Parmenio* ask'd him, How he that was ador'd by all, ſhould himſelf adore the High Prieſt of the *Jews*? To whom he anſwered, that he did not adore him, but God, whoſe High Prieſt he was. For, ſays he, I ſaw him in this ſame Habit when I was in *Dio* in *Macedon*, who exhorted me, deliberating how I might ſubdue *Aſia*, to be of good Courage, and forthwith lead out my Army, for by his Conduct I ſhould gain the *Perſian* Empire. But *Ganz* tells us, his Captains and Servants admiring (at his Bowing to the High Prieſt) and indeed being diſpleaſed at it, he ſaid to *them*, That an Angel, who that night in a Viſion walk'd before him in his Army, was in Figure and Form like to that Man. — *Joſephus* ſays the *Jews* asked ſeveral Prvileges and Immunities of *Alexander*, and he granted them. *Ganz* ſays he ask'd of *Simeon Juſtus*, that he would make his Image of Gold, and place it in the Temple between the Steps and the Altar; to which the High Prieſt replyed, that it was forbid them by God, to make any Graven Image, but they would provide for him a better Commemoration (μνημόσυνον) *viz.* that all the Sons that were born that year, ſhould be called by his Name, *Alexander.* With which the King was well pleaſed.

And now I ſuppoſe the great Difference of telling this Story is no great Credit to it. And it is very remarkable what *Vorſtius* (the Editor of *Ganz*) ſays concerning this very Story. He tells us, that *Joſippus* does not tell this Story of *Alexander* and *Simeon* the ſame way; for he ſays that *Alexander* meditating on the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, an Angel with a Sword appeared to him, threatening to kill him, *&c.* And then *Vorſtius* adds, † *But that there is nothing of Truth in this* Fable, *there are many things argue, that I ſay nothing of the profound ſilence of this matter, in the genuine* Joſephus, Arrian *and* Curtius, *who certainly would never have paſſed* P. 245.

† *Sed nihil veri ſubeſſe hujuſ fabellæ non pauca arguunt. Ne quid jam dicam, quod altum ſit ſilentium de hac re, apud* Joſephum *genuinum apud* Arrianum, *&* Curtium, *qui ſane eximium hoc factum non præteriiſſent, cum ſæpius minutiora ſectentur. Diverſa hujus hiſtoriæ narratio vanitatem ſuam ubique prodit.*

by ſuch a famous Inſtance, when they often take notice of things of far leſs moment. The differing Relation of this Story every way ſhews the Vanity of it. I muſt confeſs that I was much ſurpiſed, when I read of the *profound ſilence of this Story in the genuine* Joſephus, *&c.* and ſo, I ſuppoſe, will any Man elſe that conſiders the Learning and Care of this Author. But that he did not ſay this inconſiderately, and out of Negligence or Forgetfulneſs, is plain; for in a few Lines after, and in the very next Paragraph, ſpeaking of the Fact of *Sanballat*, and the building the Temple in Mount *Girizim* (and the place he refers to, is page 60, 61. concerning *Sanballat* building that Temple by the permiſſion of *Alexander*, and making his Son-in-law *Manaſſes* his High Prieſt, he quotes the very Book and Chapter where theſe things are now in *Joſephus*, and plainly ſays, *Flavius* (*Joſephus*) *has nothing of theſe things in the eighth Chapter of the eleventh Book of his Antiquities:* which is the very Book and Chapter where all theſe things are now extant.

Nihil de his Flavius in Antiq. lib. 11. cap. 8. Ibid. pag. 146.

I am not now at leiſure to read over the whole Book, but I remember ſomewhere he complains of the Corruption of theſe Books of *Joſephus* which are abroad. And if he had another Copy, or ancient Manuſcript, in which this Story is not, it would *vindicate Joſephus* much better than any thing our Author hath ſaid. And if he had not, it will be very hard (conſidering the Man) to give any tolerable Account of theſe Paſſages. But let that be as it will, his Argument is the ſame, and the ſtronger if it be alſo related in another manner by the genuine *Joſephus*; for if the Variety and Diſcrepancy in the Relation of a Story be an Argument of the Vanity of it, then the greater *Variety* ſtill more confirms it. And *Joſephus* relating it yet *differently*, ſtrengthens the Inference, that therefore *it is but a Fable, and hath no Truth in it.* And here it may not be amiſs to add a Remark of a very Learned Author of our own, which comes home to the purpoſe, it is Dr. *Lightfoot*, who ſpeaking of this very Story, ſays, *The Talmudiſts own the Story, but alter the Name,* &c. And then adds, *Let thoſe indeavour to reconcile* Joſephus *with the* Talmudiſts, *who believe any thing of the Story and thing it ſelf.*

2 vol. p. 100.

And therefore, as an Addition to this, I ſhall yet give a further remarkable Inſtance. And that is, that the *Samaritans* themſelves lay claim to this very Story. It is to be found in *Chronico Samaritano*, brought over by Dr. *Huntington*, and by him given to the Univerſity Library in *Oxford*, and which is very ancient, and ends about the time of *Mahomet*. I give it according to the Tranſlation of the Learned Doctor *Barnard*.

When

* When *Alexander* the Great went through *Neapolis* of *Samaria* into *Ægypt*, *Hezekiah* in the fifteenth year of his High Prieſthood bleſſed him, kneeling upon his knees. The *Macedonian* having in his Sleep ſeen ſuch a Man in Prieſtly Habit, promiſing him all proſperity in the *Perſian* War. And therefore *Alexander* gave great Gifts to the High Prieſt, and to *Samaria*, and moreover with this Teſtimony, Now I know certainly, that your God is greater than all Gods, and alſo *Hezekia* compoſed ſacred Hymns, and ſung *Hoſanna*.

* Anno ante Chriſtum, 331. Mundi, 4094.

Alexandro M. cum per Neapolin Samariæ in Ægyptum contenderet, in genua decumbenti benedixit Hezekia pontificatus ſui anno 15. qualem hominem habitu Sacerdotali per quietem nuper viderat Macedo de Bello Perſico proſpera ei omnia pollicentem. Hunc ergo antiſtitem & gentem Samaritanam donis magnis cumulavit Alexander item hoc Elogio, jam certe novi Deum veſtrum Diis cunctis eſſe majorem. Item Hezekia hymnos ſacros compoſuit, & Hoſanna.

And it is yet further to be obſerved from this *Chronicle*, that there is an exact and particular Succeſſion of their Schiſmatical High Prieſts, together with the years each of them held that Office, and this far higher than the Days of *Alexander*, and yet no ſuch name as *Manaſſes* to be found amongſt them. A particular Account of this *Chronicon*, together with the thing it ſelf, I hope that profoundly Learned Man before-mentioned, from whoſe *Excerpta* I tranſcribe this, will one time bleſs the World with. In the mean time, it is not only very ancient, but ſeems to be the Work of ſeveral Ages, and a Succeſſion of publick *Memoirs* kept up by the Body of the *Sichemites*, like the many continued Chronicles of our Monaſteries, and thoſe of the *Chineſes*. The laſt known Author is *Abulphelacus*, who brought it down no lower than the year 1492. And ſome things are ſo particular, as could hardly have been preſerved otherwiſe than by Coæval Obſervations. And there are ſeveral particulars of time ſo well connected, as that they could hardly have been the Inventions of later Ages. The *Samaritans* are frequently mentioned in the *Roman* Hiſtories and Laws, as ſtill in a Body in the very place of *Sichem* even till the *Hegira*. So that they had the ſame convenience of preſerving their *Memoirs* as the *Jews* themſelves, excepting what is mentioned in Scripture.

Our Author having conſidered the *Difficulties* in Chronology, and which he tells us he hath *proved to be none*, (how well let the Reader judge) comes now to conſider, the *ſeveral Inconſiſtences in the Story it ſelf, noted by* Salian. To which our Author anſwers,

That Jeſuit *was an Enemy to the very name of* Joſephus *for* Scaliger's *ſake.* Well! it muſt be confeſſed, that that is a good Anſwer indeed which will ſerve all Purpoſes, Nations, Times and Perſons. The Heathens they hated the *Jews*, and the *Jewiſh* Chronologers hated *Joſephus*, and *Salian* was an Enemy to his very Name, and who would matter what ſuch *malicious* Folks as they ſaid? And if this be not enough to ſilence all Men that ſpeak againſt *Joſephus*, or queſtion any thing that he

he ſays, it is a very hard Caſe. But our Author tells us, *He will take the Inconſiſtencies as they lie.*

The firſt is, that Joſephus *ſaith, the* Phenicians *and* Chaldæans, *who followed* Alexander, *when he came againſt* Jeruſalem, *thought to have plundered the City. Now, ſaith the Objector, how ſhould he have* Chaldæans *in his Army, when as yet he had not taken* Babylon, *nor came near to* Chaldæa.

He anſwers, *He might have* Chaldæans *of thoſe whom he had taken at* Iſſus, *many of whom turned over to* Alexander, *and ſerved him, as he told* Darius *in his Epiſtle.* For the proof of this, our Author quotes in the Margent, *Arrian de Exped. Alex.* 2. Now indeed in that Letter *Alexander* tells him, that as many of his ſide who were ſaved at the Battel, and fled over to him, he took care of them, and they fought for him willingly. And what then? How many were theſe in all? And how many of them were *Chaldæans?* Certainly not likely to be ſo many, and to make ſuch a Figure in *Alexander*'s Army, that their Deſires of Booty and Plunder ſhould be particularly taken notice of; and therefore this may ſtill go for an *Inconſiſtency.* But our Author does not much trouble himſelf with this, but hath found an *Inconſiſtency*, that the *malicious Salian* himſelf never ſo much thought on, and I dare ſay, no body elſe. And it is this, *I confeſs I know not why theſe* Chaldæans *ſhould be named together with the* Phœnicians, *as if theſe two Nations ſhould be eager for the Spoils of* Jeruſalem *above all the reſt that were in* Alexander's *Army, there muſt be ſome Reaſon for this Eagerneſs in theſe two Nations above others.* And our Author aſſigns two, *probably either their own eſpecial Gain, or for ſome National Spite againſt the* Jews. (Now I always expected that *Spite* and Malice muſt be one Reaſon.) And accordingly he tells, *That for the* Phœnicians *the firſt of the Reaſons is plain, becauſe they had the chief Sea Ports, and the Trade of that part of the World: therefore* Tyrus *ſaid of old, Aha! ſhe is broken, I* Ezek. 26. 2. *ſhall be repleniſhed when ſhe is laid waſte. And the ſame hope they might have now again.* Yes by all means, when *Tyre* it ſelf was laid waſte, and deſolate but juſt before. *But* (ſays he) *no other Nation could be ſo intent upon the Spoils of* Jeruſalem *but only for ſpite. And that was not to be imagined in the* Chaldæans, *who after ſo long acquaintance as they had with the* Jews *in their Captivity, were kinder to them than any other People, and have continued ſo ever ſince.* Well, this is ſomething however, I am glad to hear, the *Heathens* have had, and ſtill continue ſo much *Kindneſs* to the *Jews.* I hope hereafter their *Hatred* of the *Jews* will not paſs for a Reaſon of Omiſſion or Silence of any thing that concerns them. But why I pray *could no other Nation be intent upon the Spoils of* Jeruſalem *but* only *for* Spite? Methinks, a little *Covetouſneſs*, or a *Thirſt* after *Prey* (a ſmall Military Virtue) might have gone for a Reaſon, it is very pleaſant F. 2.

to

to aſcribe a Soldier's deſire of Plunder to particular *Spite*. But for all that our Author tells us, *Of all the Nations that were in* Alexander's *Army, none in the World ſo likely as the* Samaritans, *and of them* Joſephus *ſays there were eight thouſand ſent by* Sanballat; *and when* Joſephus *ſpeaks of theſe people in anger, he commonly calls them* Chuthæi, *which is ſo near a word to* Chaldæi, *that I cannot forbear offering this as an Emendation of the Text; for* ΧΑΛΔΑΙΩΝ *write* ΧΟΤΘΑΙΩΝ. *And then there is no Inconſiſtency*, No truly, nor is there any Inconſiſtency whether we write ſo or no; for covetous and hungry Soldiers to be eager after the Spoils of a City full of Riches and Plenty is a great *Inconſiſtency* indeed, and for to ſolve which, there is wonderful need to mend the Text. But our Author tells us he could *not forbear* to offer this as an *Emendation*, and for to bring that in, I ſuppoſe, he could *not forbear* making ſuch an *Inconſiſtency* as was never heard of before. And it is a Queſtion, whether he found out the *Inconſiſtency* for the ſake of the *Emendation*, or *mended the Text* for the ſake of the *Inconſiſtency*.

The next thing (he ſays) *might very well have been ſpared; for there is* P. 16. *no Inconſiſtency in it, that the* Jews, *when they had found favour with Alexander, ſhould ask the like favour for their Brethren that were in* Babylon *and* Media. The Reaſon of this Inconſiſtency is, for that *Alexander* at that time had not conquered *Babylon*, nor *Media*, nor ſo much as been at them. Our Author anſwers: *Theſe Countries, tho* Alexander *had not yet conquered, yet it could not be doubted they would be ſhortly in his Hands.* I ſuppoſe becauſe the Events of War are ſo abſolutely certain, that 'tis eaſie for any Man to know them. And there is no Inconſiſtency at all for Men unconditionally to ask, and another unconditionally to promiſe, which is not in his power, and which depends upon a future Contingency. *Darius* was not in ſo deſpicable a Condition,, but had not only the greateſt part of his Empire in his Hands, but an Army to back him, and which in number was ſuperior to *Alexander's*. And neither *Alexander* himſelf, nor the *Jews*, nor any Man elſe (humanly ſpeaking) could be certain of the *Victory*; and for People to ask, and a Prince to grant Liberties and Immunities to the Inhabitants of a Countrey, which is to be fought for, is indeed but ſuch an Inconſiſtency as to divide the Spoils before the Battel is fought. Which, it ſeems, is nothing at all with our Author; for he adds, *They are much to ſeek for faults, that can find them in ſuch a clear Paſſage as this.* And truly they are *much to ſeek for* Anſwers, that can *find no better* to reconcile them. However, our Author adds,

But ſuch another is that which next follows, that the Army was aſto- P. 17. *niſh'd to ſee* Alexander *to worſhip* Jaddus. *Well they might, tho it was but a Civil Worſhip*, &c. But our Author knowing the Force of the Objection did not lie in that, adds,

But the fault is, that Joſephus *ſhould put it into* Parmenio's *mouth to aſk* Alexander, *wherefore he ſhould adore another, that was himſelf adored by all. It is adjudged by* Salian *and the Objector an Inconſiſtency, to ſay that* Alexander *was adored, or that he believed himſelf the Son of* Jupiter *before his coming into* Ægypt, *&c.* The Summ of the Anſwer is: *That Adoration was paid to Eaſtern Princes that did not believe themſelves the Sons of* Jupiter, *that this was not confin'd to Crown'd Heads; for* Joſephus *tells us of* Haman *the King's Favourite, that he had adoration paid him, that the Mother of* Darius *received* Alexander *with this Ceremony, only ſhe miſtook, and paid it to* Epheſtion. *And it is not ſaid, that he refuſed to be treated with that Ceremony.* And the Concluſion is, *That he did ſuffer himſelf to be adored, even before his going into* Ægypt: *And therefore what* Joſephus *tells us of* Parmenio's *ſaying theſe words, might be true, for ought we know, however he might have ſaid them without any* Inconſiſtency. In anſwer to this, I ſhall grant our Author, That *Adoration* was paid to the Eaſtern Princes, and in particular to the Kings of *Perſia.* And I ſuppoſe our Author will grant, that it was not the Cuſtom to pay Adoration to the Weſtern Princes, nor in particular to the Kings of *Macedon.* And ſuppoſe that *Darius*'s Mother, and the *Perſian* Captives, treated *Alexander* with the ſame Ceremony they did the *Perſian* Kings, what is that to *all*, or to Adoration in general, being paid to him. For it is plain, that *Alexander* had not then taken up the *Perſian* Manners and Cuſtoms, and 'tis as plain, that the *Macedonians* and *Grecians* mortally hated not only thoſe Cuſtoms, but this in particular. And when a long time after *Alexander* inſiſted on it, they could never be brought to pay it him. And we have a memorable Inſtance of this recorded by *Arrian* and *Curtius*, when ſome time after the death of *Darius*, *Alexander* had a mind to be ador'd, according to the Cuſtom of the *Perſian* Kings, and the better to draw the *Grecians* to it, he laid a Deſign, and made an Entertainment for that purpoſe, to which among others, the Princes of *Macedon* and *Greece* were called. And as the Hiſtorian tells us, it was agreed between *Alexander* and the Sophiſters, and the great Men of *Perſia* and *Media* that were about *Alexander*, that whilſt they were at their Cups, a Diſcourſe of this Matter ſhould purpoſely be ſet on foot, and accordingly *Anaxarchus* makes a ſet Speech about it; and thoſe that were privy to the Secret, commended it; but the *Macedonians*, diſproving it, held their peace, till at length *Calliſthenes*, with a grave and ſharp Speech refutes it, which indeed nettled *Alexander*, but was very grateful to the *Greeks.* And when afterwards it came to action, and when *Alexander* had ſent ſome to mind them of what was expected from them, the *Perſians* every one in their order adored him; but for the *Greeks*, *Leonatus* mock'd them, and none of the reſt could be prevailed upon to perform it. And now it is not very likely, that ſuch a Saying ſhould come

Antiq. l. xi. 6.

Plut. in Alex.

Arian. l. 4. Curtius l. 8.

out

out of a *Macedonian's* Mouth, and *Parmenio*, who perfectly hated it, ſhould tell *Alexander*, that he was *adored* by all. Beſides (and upon which the Objection turns) it is evident enough, that *Alexander* never required it, till ſome years after the time of aſſigning this Story. And among all Hiſtorians it is reckoned as a great Inſtance of the Corruption of his Virtue, and which was moſt ungrateful to his Countreymen. And it is very conſiſtent indeed, for an Officer to tell his Prince that he was *adored by all*, when he was not adored by the greateſt part, perhaps by none at all of his whole Army, and which was very odious to them, and as far as appears, never ſo much as thought of by the Prince himſelf. And therefore altho ſome of the *Perſians* might treat him with the ſame Ceremony they did their own Kings; yet it is plain enough, that he did not receive it, at leaſt not generally; for if he had there is all the reaſon in the world to believe, that it would have been as ungrateful to his Army, and bred him as much miſchief as it did afterwards, nay rather more, in that he ſhould ſo early aſſume the *Perſian Cuſtoms*, and eſpecially, which they abominated moſt of all, to be *adored* or ſaluted by *proſtration*. And I will leave it to any Man who knows the Story, whether it be poſſible for him to believe it. And therefore notwithſtanding what our Author hath ſaid, here is a double *Inconſiſtency*. (1.) That it was ſaid by *Parmenio*, who hated the thing. And (2.) That it was [illegible] ſaid at all.

But beſides theſe *Inconſiſtencies*, I ſhall crave our Author's leave to add three more, and which in my opinion, are more conſiderable than thoſe noted by *Salian*.

1. *Joſephus* tells us, that upon ſeeing the High Prieſt in ſuch Veſtments, *Alexander* told *Parmenio*, that he did not adore the High Prieſt, but *God*: For, ſays he, I ſaw him before in this ſame Habit, when I was at *Dio*, who, when I was deliberating how to ſubdue *Aſia*, exhorted me to be of good Courage, *&c.* for by his Conduct and Guidance, I ſhould obtain the *Perſian* Empire. Wherefore, ſo ſoon as I ſaw this Habit, and being mindful of the Viſion, which moved me to this Expedition, I believe I did not lead my Army againſt *Darius* without God, and that I ſhall have the Victory according to my deſire. And afterwards *Joſephus* ſaith, that he went up into the Temple, and ſacrificed to God, according to the Prieſts Direction. And further, ſhewing him the Book of *Daniel*, wherein it is propheſied, That one of *Greece* ſhould vanquiſh the *Perſians*, which he interpreted to be himſelf. He being overjoyed, diſmiſſed the Multitude. This is the State of this Matter in *Joſephus*. And now let us ſee whether *Alexander's* Practice be not as direct a Contradiction to this as is poſſible. Now the time *Joſephus* faſtens this Story, is after the Siege of *Gaza*; and it is plain, that ſoon after *Alexander* went by tedious and dangerous Marches over Sands and Deſarts to the Oracle

Curtius l. 4. of *Jupiter Hammon*, and there own'd himſelf to be his Son, conſulted the Oracle whether he ſhould be Governor of the World, *&c.* Now put theſe together, at *Jeruſalem* *Alexander* meets with a miraculous Accident, and which wonderfully affects him. And from thence (and if it were true, there was all the reaſon in the World for it) concludes, that the God of the *Jews* moved him to the Expedition, and that under his Conduct he ſhould gain the *Perſian* Empire, and this further confirm'd by a Prophecy he found there, and yet immediately with a ſtrange eagerneſs to hunt after other Gods, and to expoſe himſelf and his Army to find them, and ſo ſoon as he comes there to own himſelf a Son, and to put himſelf under their Conduct. This, I think, (all things conſidered) is as unaccountable as any thing in the whole Story. And that which yet further confirms it, is that upon his return from the Temple of *Jupiter* Arrian l. 3. *Hammon*, when he came back to *Samaria* and *Tyre*, and there again ſacrificed to *Hercules*, that he ſhould not make one ſtep to *Jeruſalem*, and repeat his Sacrifice to that God whom he own'd (and if the Story be true, it is impoſſible he ſhould do otherwiſe) to be the Mover, and under whoſe Conduct he expected the Succeſs of his Expedition. And I believe any Man, that fairly conſiders all Circumſtances, will find it very difficult to give any equal Account of this, and eſpecially conſidering the Temper of *Alexander*, who, whatever his Religion was, loved Empire and Victory well enough, as not to be ſcrupulous in any thing that he thought might conduce thereto. And thoſe aſtoniſhing Circumſtances at *Jeruſalem* (if true) muſt have made a mighty Impreſſion on his mind, and the *Temple* of *Jeruſalem* would have been much more in his thoughts than either that of *Jupiter* in *Ægypt*, or of *Hercules* at *Tyre*. And he that ſpent ſo many days through a ſandy Deſart to the Oracle of *Hammon*, would not have neglected *Jeruſalem* upon his return, nor have omitted to ſacrifice there, when he was diligent enough to do it to *Hercules* at *Tyre*, tho he had ſacrificed to him likewiſe when he was there before. And the truth is, the Account of this matter in the *Samaritan Chronicle* (before mentioned) is far more conſiſtent than the Account in *Joſephus*; for there it is ſaid expreſly among *Ann. Chriſt.* 330. *Mun.* 4095. other things, *that* Alexander *returning from* Ægypt *through* Samaria, *worſhiped God on Mount* Girizim.

2. Another *Inconſiſtency* is, That *Joſephus* tells us, that the Temple on Mount *Girizim* was built by *Sanballat*, by leave obtained from *Alexander*. Now as *Joſephus* ſays *Sanballat* revolted to *Alexander*, upon his beginning the Siege of *Tyre*, which was ſo grateful to him, that he bid him ask what he would, and he asks him to build this Temple. Now according to *Joſephus*, the Siege of *Tyre* laſted ſeven Months, and the Siege of *Gaza* two Months, in all nine Months; and from thence *Alexander* comes to *Jeruſalem*. Now in this ſame Chapter *Joſephus* tells us, that the *Samaritans*

maritans met *Alexander* almoſt at *Jeruſalem* upon his going from thence, and taking the Soldiers of *Sanballat* with them, beſought him that he would viſit their City, and honour their *Temple* with his preſence. Then it ſeems their *Temple* was built when *Alexander* went from *Jeruſalem*, that is to ſay, it was built in nine Months, after leave obtained for the building it. And yet *Joſephus* tells us over and over, that this Temple was built after the manner of the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, which notwithſtanding all the aſſiſtance and encouragement from the Kings of *Perſia* was building as many *years*. And I will leave it with our Author, or any Man elſe, to make it credible, that ſuch a Temple could be built in nine Months, eſpecially when *Sanballat* and his Soldiers, were all that time attending in the actual Service of *Alexander*. And this I muſt leave for another *Inconſiſtency* till our Author reconcile it. But that which is yet more conſiderable, is

3. That this *wonderful Viſion* ſhould never be heard of before that Critical Time, to do the *Jews* ſuch mighty Service. As *Joſephus* tells the Story, *Alexander* had this Viſion at *Dio* ſome years before, when he was but *deliberating* on the *Perſian* Expedition, and which mightily encouraged him to undertake it. And how came *Alexander* to conceal it all this while? This certainly had been very good Doctrine to his Army, and would have done him ſervice, if he could have made them belive it, whether it were true or no. How full are Hiſtories not only of *Heathen*, but even of *Chriſtian* Princes, who have *invented* a *Divine Conduct* and *Impulſe*, and induſtriouſly ſpread it abroad, to juſtifie their Cauſe, and to animate their Followers. Alas! a *Little Creeping Manuſcript* (tho never ſo fooliſh) cannot eſcape the having τὸ Θεῖον affixed to it. And I'll warrant you, *Alexander* having ſo fair and juſt an opportunity to magnifie himſelf, and encourage his Soldiers, would lock it up as a Secret, and never make any uſe of it. Let any Man, who conſiders the temper and ambition of *Alexander*, and even human nature it ſelf, and the univerſal Experience of Mankind, believe this if he can. The *Viſion*, as *Joſephus* repreſents it, was equally *ſtrange*, and *glorious*, and of which he had no former Idea, for he could not frame to himſelf any Conception of the *Jewiſh* High Prieſt in his *Sacerdotal* Attire, by any thing he had ſeen before. And according to the Story he did not, (for then when he is ſuppoſed actually to have ſeen it, the ſight would not have been ſo aſtoniſhing and affecting) and ſo conſequently, and eſpecially conſidering *Heatheniſh Superſtition*, he could not conclude otherwiſe, than that it was from God; and *Joſephus* tells us, that he did ſo: and yet to ſay not one word of it, nor make any advantage of it, is certainly one of the ſtrangeſt things in the world. But inſtead of that we hear no more of it, neither *before*, nor *after*; his ſubſequent Progreſs is as much a ſtranger to it, as his former, and certainly, had he forgot it, (which is not

not very likely) yet when it was revived by such an extraordinary Occurrence, it would have been no inconsiderable Topick to have heartened himself and his Soldiers: and I challenge any Man to believe that *Alexander* would have neglected it. But for all that, there is a profound silence in this matter, even to the end of his Life, and tho we hear of *Jupiter Hammon* and *Hercules*, and the Gods of the Nations, yet there is not one single word of the God of the *Jews*, nor of those *Visionary* Encouragements and Promises of Success. It saved the *Jews* indeed (as *Josephus* tells us) and got them Honour, Privileges and Immunities, and there is the beginning and end of it; but for *Alexander* he made no manner of use of it. And in plain Terms, this Story seems calculated only for the Meridian of *Jerusalem*, and the Service of the *Jews*, which plainly denotes it to be a *Jewish* Fable. And (to say no more) such things were but too common among the *Jews* in the Age foregoing *Josephus*, and frequent among the *Hellenists* of those times, as is evident from the Book of *Tobit*, *Judith*, the Prophecy of *Enoch*, the Assumption of *Mosei*, the Prophecy of *Eldad* and *Medad* in *Hermes's Pastor*, and many more. And what if such a Legendary Tale should pass traditionally in *Josephus's* time, and he take it up, and insert it in his History for a truth, tho it hath no other Foundation than the Figments and Fancies of those *Hellenists*, and *Josephus* himself gives us no Author for this. And I think this is a better *Vindication* of *Josephus* than any thing our Author hath said for him.

The Truth is, this whole Story seems like other Fictions, to be grounded on false Reasonings on true History, like the History of S *George* and the *Dragon*, which of an original Truth is made a meer Legend and Romance. There was such a Man as S. *George*, and there were such persons as *Sanballat*, *Jaddus* and *Alexander*: and a little *Hellenistical* Fancy (of which that Age was full) might easily jumble them together, and confound differing times, to frame a Romantick Story, that never had any real being. And what wonder is it, if *Josephus* took a Story upon trust which made for the Honour of his Nation, and was already invented to his Hands? And it is plain enough, that (whatever our Author does) *Josephus* himself gave no such great credit to it; for in his Book against *Appion*, which was purposely writ to *vindicate* his *Antiquities*, wherein, with great Pains and Learning he hath endeavoured to confirm the Antiquity and Honour of his Nation from the Testimony of Foreigners. And yet he has not one word of *this* glorious Testimony of *Alexander*, which notwithstanding his Argument and Method directly led him to, and was as fit (at least) for his purpose as any thing he hath said, and which he could not reasonably pretermit without injury to his Cause, if he had believed it unexceptionable, and not liable to Objection. He plainly and copiously speaks of *Alexander's* kindness

Joseph. contra Appion. l. 2

kindneſs to the *Jews* at *Alexandria*, and of the great Privileges he granted them, when he placed them there, but not the leaſt intimation of his Acknowledgment and Adoration of *Jaddus*, and at *Jeruſalem*, and the mighty things he there did for them, which certainly had been a far greater Teſtimony, and more to his purpoſe. He tells us (upon the ſame deſign) that *Ptolomy Euergetes*, upon the Conqueſt of *Syria*, that *he did not ſacrifice to the* Ægyptian *Gods, but coming to* Jeruſalem *he ſacrificed to God according to the Cuſtom of the* Jews. But there is not one word of *Alexander's ſacrificing* there, nor the leaſt mention of thoſe miraculous Circumſtances which attended it, which notwithſtanding is by many degrees a fairer inſtance to prove the Honour of his Nation, and the Reputation of his Religion, than the bare act of *Ptolemy's* ſacrificing. *Joſephus* wanted neither Skill nor Eloquence to amplifie and improve every thing that was for his advantage: and 'tis plain enough to a Man but of an ordinary Talent, how ſuitable this was to his Deſign, and what great Advantages might have been made of it to prove his point. And I ſhall leave it with our *Author*, or any Man elſe, to give any other reaſon of his *total omiſſion and ſilence*, of what was ſo exceedingly cogent and pertinent to his purpoſe, (and eſpecially conſidering his mentioning of *Alexander* and his kindneſs, and the ſacrificing of another Prince at *Jeruſalem*, as inſtances of Honour done to his Nation) but that it was, that (tho he inſerted this Story in his Hiſtory) yet he durſt not inſiſt upon it, when the Matter came to Argument and Diſpute. There is a great Difference between bare *Narratives* and *cloſe Diſputes:* and tho *Joſephus* might take the Story, perhaps as he found it, yet when he came to debate the matter, he e'en let it ſhift for it ſelf as well as it could, and never ſo much as alledged it, or *vindicated* it. But hath left that Honour to his *Vindicator*. *Ibid.*

I now proceed to our Author, who after having ſaid, That *his Anſwers* to thelaſt Inconſiſtences of *Salian* before-mentioned, *are ſo plain, that he cannot think how it came to paſs, that I did not ſee them,* (and yet I profeſs, as plain as they are, I cannot *ſee* them now, nor, I doubt, the Reader neither) but he gives a Reaſon, *Except* Joſephus *had offended him ſo much, that he was too greedy of Objections againſt him, that he did not regard what might be ſaid in his* Vindication. Now as to *Offence*, I muſt ſay, that neither *Joſephus*, nor our Author have *offended* me; and as to his *Vindication*, , I did not before *regard* what our Author would ſay, but it was becauſe I did not know it; but, I hope, by this time, our Author will be ſatified, that I have *regarded* it.

He adds, *In this angry Humour, he runs on in the next Page, and there he calls in* Calviſius *to be his Second.* Well! I thought ſuch a Second as *Calviſius* in point of Chronology might have been pretty well; but it ſeems I am miſtaken; for our Author tells us,

He

He could not have found a fitter man to take his part; for he had a quarrel of his own againſt Joſephus *for writing ſuch things, as would not conſiſt with his Chronology.* Once again we have got this univerſal Anſwer, that ſtops all Gaps, and fits all purpoſes; I wonder which way I ſhould find a Man for our *Author*'s turn, I have named to him, *Heathens, Jews, Jeſuits* and *Chriſtians*, and yet none of them will go down with him: and I know not how to ſatisfie our Author, except I could bring a Man that in all points agreed with *Joſephus*, and where is ſuch an *Author* to be found; For my part I know of none ſuch; and I am ſure the *Vindicator* of *Joſephus* is not ſuch a one, who writes things as *inconſiſtent* with *Joſephus* as *Calviſius* himſelf; and ſo for any thing I can ſee our Author's Exception lies againſt all Mankind, and againſt himſelf. And *Salian, Calviſius*, yea, and the *Vindicator* too, *have a quarrel of their own againſt* Joſephus *for writing ſuch things as would not conſiſt with their Chronology.* And therefore with our *Author*'s good leave, he is every way *as fit for my turn* as *Calviſius* himſelf. And if it would ſave our Author the trouble of making ſuch hard Reflections on the above-mentioned Writers, I am contented to venture my Argument that follows on our Author's Account, and difference from *Joſephus*. And I am miſtaken, if it does not as ſtrongly conclude from what our Author himſelf ſays, as from what *Calviſius* ſays, or any other *quarrelſome* Chronologer of them all. And this will appear preſently. In the mean time, with reſpect to *Calviſius*, our Author tells us, *This was* Scaliger's *Fault, who had cramped that part of* Calviſius's *Chronology, by beginning* Daniel's *ſeventy weeks in* Darius Nothus's. *And in conſequence of that* Nehemiah's Artaxerxes *muſt be* Mnemon, *not* Longimanus, *and the* Darius *he mentions not* Nothus, *but* Codomanus. *And if* Nehemiah *liv'd to* Codomanus's *time, ſo might his* Sanballat *as well. And then why ſhould not the High Prieſt be* Manaſſes, *the ſame that is mentioned in* Joſephus? *And this both* Scaliger *and* Calviſius *are for; and the Objector, if he pleaſed, might have quoted them for theſe things.* Right, and I did ſo; and a good part of what concerns the Caſe of *Jaddus* is ſpent in confuting it. And it is very pleaſant for our Author to tell me, I might have *quoted them.* And what follows is of the ſame ſtamp. *But then his Arithmetick would have been of no uſe, for* Sanballat's *one hundred forty years would have been but eighty,* Manaſſes *might have been a young man, and* Jaddus *of middle Age.* Right again, and therefore I particularly examined that Account, and I think plainly ſhewed the miſtake of it. But then what does our Author mean by telling me, I *might*, if I had pleaſed, have *quoted* them for *theſe things*, when I not only *quoted* them, but ſhewed the miſtake of *theſe very things.* But this is the fruit of disjointing a Diſcourſe, and arguing againſt Scraps and Parcels, without conſidering either the intire Diſcourſe, or the Coherence. Our Author skipping over two parts of the

Anſw. p. 7.

Diſcourſe,

Diſcourſe, finds that I had there *quoted Calviſius*, and preſently concludes, I had not *quoted* him before, tho I had but the foregoing Leaf (which perhaps our Author never look'd on) not only particularly mention'd theſe very things, but fully examin'd them, and it takes up almoſt a third part of the whole. Well! But our *Author* tells us, *Thoſe two learned Men were ſo far from ſeeing any difficulty in the Story of* Jaddus, *as* Joſephus *tells it, that they take it for unqueſtionable Hiſtory.* And ſo they do, and that is one reaſon why they are both ſo miſtaken in their Chronology: for they place *Nehemiah*'s going up to *Jeruſalem* in the Reign of *Mnemon* and not *Longimanus*, and particularly object the Age of *Sanballat* to the contrary Opinion, and therefore if *Nehemiah* (which is our Authors account as well as mine) went up to *Jeruſalem* in the Reign of *Longimanus*, *Sanballat* according to theſe two learned Men, at the time of *Alexander*'s taking of *Tyre*, muſt have been above one hundred forty five years old, *And our Author alſo if he pleaſed might have quoted them for theſe things.* But then our Author asks, *Why then does the Objector bring in* Calviſius *as if he were on his ſide in this Argument?* But he anſwers it himſelf, *He will ſay He doth not, here is no mention of* Jaddus. *Very well, but here are hard Cenſures on* Joſephus, *which being brought in in this place tho they do not belong to it, may ſerve as well as if they did: Tho* Calviſius *intended them for things wherein* Joſephus *differ'd from him, yet the Reader may apply them to that* Story *wherein he agreed with him.*

Now here we have an inſtance of our Authors dexterity in turning off an Argument, which I preſume he could not fairly anſwer. The place he refers to is a general Inference or Argument, I drawed from the whole. The ſum of which is: *That a Story clogg'd with ſuch Difficulties cannot be drawn into Argument in reference to Practice*; and to confirm this I quoted *Calviſius*, who gives us this account of *Joſephus*, and his Hiſtory of theſe Times. *They that reſt upon the Authority of* Joſephus *ſtand upon a very ſlippery and weak foundation*; and farther adds, *When* Joſephus *is ſo much out concerning theſe Times, who can* ſafely *give Credit to what he aſſerts.* Theſe are what our Author calls *hard Cenſures.* But the Queſtion is, whether they be true or no; if not, why did not our Author diſprove them? but inſtead of that he calls them *hard*, but neither anſwers, nor yet ſo much as mentions them, and yet my Argument is plainly drawn from them. But there was ſome reaſon for this, for whatſoever he had ſaid upon this general Inference would have turned home upon him. And therefore it was far better to run over it with general Reflections, or to obſcure it, than to come cloſe to it, and fairly examine it. Our *Author* cannot deny but *Joſephus was out* in the Hiſtory of theſe Times, or if he did, his own account confutes him; and then from theſe Premiſſes I would fain know why *Calviſius*'s Concluſion does not follow, *who can* ſafely *rely on what he aſſerts* concerning theſe Times.

Anſw. p. 11.

Calv. p. 148.

that is to ſay, this Concluſion follows as naturally from our *Author* as from *Calviſius*, tho he does not ſay ſo in ſo many words. And here I ſhall make good my word, and ſhew that our Author fits my turn as well as *Calviſius* or any other Chronologer. For according to our Authors own account contradictory to *Joſephus*'s (as appears before) it is plain, *Joſephus*'s Authority is not to be rely'd on concerning the Hiſtory of thoſe Times; And this Story of *Jaddus* and *Sanballat* ſtands purely on the Authority of *Joſephus*, and in a manner contrary to much better Authority. However, if that Authority in matters relating to thoſe Times, be not ſufficient to be rely'd on, then the Story of *Jaddus* ſtanding upon that Authority is not to be rely'd on, nor to be drawn into Argument. And therefore 'tis mere Sophiſtry what our Author ſays with reſpect to *Calviſius*, (and which he may alſo ſay with reſpect to himſelf) *That* Calviſius *intended them in things wherein* Joſephus *differed from him*, for the Concluſion is general; And if *Joſephus*'s Authority is not to be rely'd on in things wherein he differs from *Calviſius* and our Author: I would fain know why his Authority (which is the only Queſtion) is to be rely'd on in things wherein he agrees with them. The Agreement or diſagreement with our Author, or with *Calviſius* makes no difference in the *Authority* of *Joſephus*. And therefore I conclude from our *Author* as well as from *Calviſius* that the Authority of *Joſephus* in the Hiſtory of thoſe Times is not to be rely'd on, and before our Author can diſprove it I doubt he muſt alter his Chronological Scheme; and if he does that, he will be as hard put to it to *Vindicate Joſephus* on the other hand.

And this is General, and the Inference reaches to what account other Chronologers give of thoſe times, as well as *Calviſius* and our Author; for (as far as I know) excepting *Voſſius*, there is not one ſingle Chronologer, or Hiſtorian that agrees with *Joſephus* in his account of thoſe times. The Author told me before, that *I brought all Chronologers* on my ſide *againſt* Joſephus. But that is his miſtake; I brought them indeed *againſt* Joſephus, which makes my Argument good againſt his Authority. But he tells me, *I ſhould have excepted all the beſt both Antient and Modern, and particularly the excellent Primate*; but by his favour I will neither except the *Primate*, nor any other ſince thoſe times but *Voſſius*, and I am ſure the Primate differs from *Joſephus* as much as *Calviſius* tho not in the ſame inſtances, and I deſire our Author among thoſe many numerous and learned Authors, who have conſider'd the *Perſian* Monarchy and the affairs of the *Jews* contemporary therewith, to name one that agrees with *Joſephus* if he can. Any mortal man that reads the whole account *Joſephus* gives us of the *Perſian* Monarchy (if he was not acquainted with other Hiſtories) could not otherwiſe than believe, that from the time of releaſing the Captivity to *Alexander*, there were but five Kings of *Perſia* or ſix at the moſt, whereas in truth there were twelve or thirteen.

Pag. 14.

I know

I know *Voſſius*, to take off the edg of this, ſays, That *Joſephus prudently omitted thoſe Kings of* Perſia *with whom the* Jews *had no matter of concern, for that He wrote the Hiſtory of the* Jews, *not of the* Perſians. Which is a ſtrange Reaſon from ſo learned a man, as if the *Jews* had no concern always with their Principal and Supreme Governours, upon whom they did immediately depend, and by whoſe Authority all their affairs were manag'd; or as if the very names of their Supreme Governours were not ſufficient matter for Hiſtory; or further, as if, during the Reigns of ſo many ſeveral Kings for the ſpace altogether of 130 years, there was nothing remarkable in *Judea* and fit for an Hiſtorian to take notice of. It is plain enough therefore, either that *Joſephus* was very negligent in tranſmitting the Hiſtory of thoſe times, or that the Records and memory of them were loſt, and he was left to mere Conjecture and Opinion. Either of which makes good the Concluſion, that his Authority with reſpect to thoſe times is not ſufficient to be rely'd on. And it is plain enough, that no man beſides *Voſſius* believes him, or relies upon his Authority, in his account of thoſe times. And I wonder why *Joſephus*'s Authority is better in the Story of *Jaddus*, than in other matters relating to thoſe times. Suppoſe a man pretending to write a Hiſtory of *England*, and to give account of the Original, Antiquities, and affairs of the *Britiſh* Nation, and coming to conſider the *Norman* Conqueſt, ſhould leave out one third part of the Kings, and neither name them, nor any thing at all done in their times, and yet write as if he gave the whole Hiſtory. I wonder whether any man would take a ſingle Story relating to thoſe times, only upon *his* Credit, and eſpecially if it was a Caſe of Conſcience, and concern'd Practiſe, which is plainly the Caſe.

Chronol. ſacra. p. 150.

By this time I ſuppoſe our Author may be ſatisfied, that He was a little too haſty in charging me with *Inſincerity, for not quoting what makes againſt me in my own Authors*. For I did not quote theſe Authors for their opinion of this Story, but for the general judgment they give of Joſephus *and his Hiſtory of thoſe times*, and which judgment of theirs is certainly true, and our Author cannot deny it, without denying alſo the foundation of his *Vindication*, which makes good my Inference, what opinion ſoever they might have of that Story. And as our Author ſays (and which he intends for an anſwer) *it will ſerve as well* for that purpoſe; *and tho* Calviſius *intended them for things wherein* Joſephus *differs from him, yet the Reader may apply them* (and honeſtly too, for they are as applicable) *to that Story wherein he agreed with him.*

But after all, what does our *Author* ſay to two other famous Chronologers, whom I had mention'd, who do not only give the ſame account of *Joſephus*, but come home to the very Story, and plainly intimate their *ſuſpition* of it, to ſay no more. And thoſe are our *Lydiat* and *Temporarius* whoſe words I had at large recited, and becauſe our Author will not take

Anſw. page 10.

De Emend. Temp. page 65. take any notice of them, I muſt be forc'd to repeat them. *Lydiat* ſpeaking of *Sanballat*, ſaith, either this was another from him who was Father-in-law to one of the Sons of *Iciada*, whom *Nehemiah* mentions, (*and by the way* Lydiat *never thought of our Authors difference between the* Horonite *and* Chulhæan) or elſe *Joſephus* is equally falſe, and contrary to himſelf in determining the Age in which *Sanballat* lived, as he is in almoſt all the Chronology of the *Perſian* Monarchy. And *Johannes Temporarius* is yet more full. And after having prov'd the Inconſiſtency by Chronology ſays -- It is neceſſary that the *Sanballat* and *Jaddus*, in the Hiſtory of *Joſephus*, either they are diverſe from them whom *Ezra* mentions, or, which *I rather ſuſpect*, they are the moſt vain Fictions of *Joſephus* himſelf concerning *Jaddus* and *Sanballat*. Now here we have two very learned and conſiderable Authors, and both of them as great and skilful in Chronology as perhaps any Age hath had who not only deliver the ſame account of *Joſephus*, but make the ſame Inference of the *ſuſpiciouſneſs* of this Story; The one with reſpect to *Sanballat*, and the other with reſpect both to *Jaddus* and *Sanballat*: and that which makes their Teſtimony yet more conſiderable is, (as I ſaid) *that they were not at all concern'd in the preſent Controverſie*, and conſequently could have no byaſs on their Judgments on that account. And what did our *Author* ſay to all this? Why truly not one ſingle word, nor ſo much as vouchſafe them the leaſt notice. I fanſie our Author ſuſpected his Anſwer would not hold out any longer, and *hatred* and *malice*, and *particular quarrel* had quite ſpent it ſelf on the *Heathens* and *Jews* on *Salian* and *Calviſius*, and having not another ready, or perhaps not knowing how to fit that fine Character to *Lydiat* and *Temporarius*, He e'en let them alone, and has nothing to ſay to them, tho if I miſtake not their Cenſures are as *hard* on *Joſephus* as *Calviſius* or any man elſe: and my *quotations* out of them come home to the very Caſe. He tells me, before, *I call'd in* Calviſius *to be my Second, and that I could not have found a fitter man to take my part*; and yet there were two others almoſt in the ſame place, and neither of them inferiour to *Calviſius*, who are much more fit for my purpoſe, and yet our Author (I ſuppoſe, becauſe he could not prove any *malice* upon them) has not one word to ſay to them, tho at the ſame time he charges *me with Suſpition of Inſincerity for* omitting thoſe words *that make againſt me in my own Authors*. But if it be an argument of *Inſincerity* in me to omit *words* that make againſt me, I pray what is it to *omit* two intire *quotations* that make againſt him?

Pag. 19. Our Author now comes to the *Convocation Book*, and begins, *If our Author dealt candidly in this* (i. e. the quotation out of *Calviſius* and the inference from it) *He doth not ſo always. We have a great inſtance of the contrary in his ſhuffling and cutting with the Convocation Book.* Well! To *ſhuffle and cut* which the Convocation Book, is not fairly done; nor yet

is it very fair to charge a Man with doing ſo, and not be able to prove it. But in order to that our Author ſays, *He, againſt whom he writes, had urg'd the Example of* Jaddus, *for ſomething which the Objector doth not like, and to give the more Credit to it, he ſaith (as here he is quoted) that whether the Story be true or no, the Convocation ſeems to believe it, he gives very good reaſon to judge ſo, becauſe they have inſerted part of it into the Convocation-Book.* Now all this buſineſs, which our Author puts into ſuch a ſpruce Form, is nothing elſe but an Objection which I had rais'd, and which it was neceſſary for me to ſpeak to conſidering the Subject-matter of the Diſcourſe; there is not one ſingle word, nor intimation of all theſe fine Things, of urging the *Example* of *Jaddus*; *and to give the greater Credit to it, becauſe it is in the Convocation*; *and after that a good reaſon to judge ſo*, but an Objection barely and nakedly propos'd: ſo that if our Author had pleas'd he might have let all this Flouriſh alone: for I do not know any great need, of propoſing an Objection in Mood and Figure; and making a long buſineſs of that, which may be diſpatch'd in few words. The Objection in the *Anſwer* is thus: 'If it be ſaid, That whether the Story be 'true, or no, the Convocation ſeems to believe it, and have inſerted part 'of it into the Convocation book. And it is not matter of Fact, but 'their ſence we are enquiring into. — And to which I thus anſwer: 'I 'ſay ſo too, but I ſay likewiſe, that their ſence is not to be extended be-'yond their words, nor are they to be made Parties to any more of the 'Story, than they have inſerted in their Book. —— And accordingly I ſhew what they have inſerted, and conſequently to what part of it they can only be preſum'd to be Parties. And what does our Author ſay to this? Why truly he tells us, *They have taken in all that the Objector hath thrown out, concerning* Sanballat, Manaſſes *and* Jaddus, which is the pleaſanteſt anſwer in the World, for it is the very Objection, and granted in my Anſwer; and this we get by flouriſhing Things over, and we muſt have the ſame thing in *Reply* to an *Anſwer* to an Objection, which is the Objection it ſelf. Well! but they expreſly quote Joſephus *for it as their Author*. Right, and I wonder whom elſe they ſhould quote for it. He adds,-- *Tho by making his* Sanballat *the ſame with* Nehemiah's, *it appears that they follow* Scaliger *and* Calviſius *in their Chronology*. Why then I doubt they *take in* what our Author hath *thrown out*: But how does our Author collect, that they followed the *Chronology* of *Scaliger* or *Calviſius*? I doubt our Author muſt ſtrain a point of Chronology to prove it, for I believe the Chronology of *Calviſius* or *Scaliger* either were not extant at the ſitting of the Convocation. But that is not the Queſtion: Let them follow what Computation our Author thinks fit. It is all one in the preſent Caſe, The Queſtion we are now upon is not Chronology, but their ſence of matter of Fact. And therefore our Author adds, *But for the Story they not only take it for an undoubted Truth, but they reaſon upon it, as to matter of Practice our Ob-*

Anſw. pag. 11.

Convoc. Ch. 30. p. 63.

jector

jector ſays well, that Men that have any care of their Souls will hardly venture to act upon one ſingle Example, and that only vouch'd but by a ſingle and ſuſpitious Author. *They may do well to conſider this that go in untrodden ways, and yet damn all them that will not follow them.* Now here are two things our Author is bound to prove, and which he may do at his leaſure. 1. That thoſe that differ from him go in *untrodden ways:* and 2. That they *damn* all them that do not follow them. And 'till he can do that, his Reflection turns upon him; But theſe are big words, and may ſerve for ſomething or other when there is want of better argument. He adds, *But it is upon the ſingle Example of* Jaddus *having ſworn to* Darius, *that the Convocation ſaith, that the* Jewiſh *High Prieſts were bound to the Kings of* Perſia *by an Oath, when they were made High Prieſts.* That is to ſay, they prove a matter of Fact by an Inſtance; and I wonder what way beſides there is to prove it. They prove the High Prieſts of *Judea* took an Oath to the Kings of *Perſia* when they were made High Prieſts, becauſe *Jaddus* did ſo. A great matter indeed and much to our Authors purpoſe. He goes on, *And they add this judgment upon it, That* 'if any man 'affirm-- that *Jaddus* the High Prieſt did amiſs in binding his Allegiance to King *Darius* by an Oath, or that he had not ſinn'd if he had refus'd (being thereunto requir'd) ſo to have ſworn —— he doth greatly err. *It is plain,* ſays he, *that they affirm this upon one ſingle Example, and that alſo vouch'd but by a ſingle Authority.* A very fine Reaſon indeed, What does our Author make of the Convocation? as if they eſtabliſh'd a point of *practical* Religion, from a *ſingle* Example, and by the *Single Authority* of *Joſephus.* The Point of Practice here is the *Taking* (yea and *keeping* too) of an Oath to a Lawful Prince. And our *Author* would make us believe, that the *Convocation* build this upon the *Single Example* of *Jaddus,* and that vouch'd by the *Single Authority* of *Joſephus,* which is a fine Complement to *Joſephus,* and makes him not only *equal,* but e'en Superiour to the *Scriptures* themſelves. Which however our Author may like, (who is ſo eager in *vindicating Joſephus,* that he cares not what he ſays either againſt his Adverſaries or for him.) Yet the *Convocation* never thought of any ſuch thing. But do they not ſay, *If any man affirm that* Jaddus *the High Prieſt did* amiſs *in binding his Allegiance to* Darius *by Oath?* Right, But do they prove whether this was *amiſs* or no by *Jaddus*'s Practice? And do they not ſay, *or that he had not* ſinn'd, *if he had refus'd ſo to have ſworn.* Right again, but do they prove whether he had, or had not, *ſinn'd* by his own *taking* or *refuſing* the Oath? which are pure Proofs and like our Authors *unanſwerable* ones. And therefore our Author (who complains ſo much of Inſincerity for omitting what makes againſt a man) hath himſelf left out the principal thing, and which would plainly have ſhew'd the ſence of the Convocation. For thus they begin that very *Canon* our Author refers to. 'If any man therefore ſhall affirm, *con-*

Convoc. Can. 30. pag. 65.

Convoc. pag. 64.

'*trary*

'trary to the grounds and Truths of the ſaid Holy Scriptures, either that 'albeit the Kings of *Perſia* —— or that the *Jews* might lawfully have re- 'bell'd, —— or that *Jaddus* the High Prieſt did amiſs, &c. He doth great- 'ly err. So that 'tis plain enough, the foundation of their Reaſoning here is, the *grounds and Truths of the Scriptures*, and whoever affirms, That *Jaddus* did *amiſs* in binding himſelf by Oath to *Darius*, or that he had not *ſinn'd* if he had refus'd ſo to do, he doth greatly err; and the reaſon of that is, not becauſe *Jaddus* did, or did not, ſo, much leſs becauſe *Joſephus* ſaid it; but becauſe it *is contrary to the grounds and truths of the Holy Scriptures*. So that with our Authors good leave, They do not argue from the *Story* to Practice, *i. e.* to eſtabliſh a practical Point, but the contrary. And yet our Author talks of *Shuffling* and *Cutting* with the Convocation; and what I wonder does He call this?

Our Author indeed might fairly from hence have argued to the ſence of the Convocation, and from what he hath quoted it plainly appears to be their ſence, That for the High Prieſt to take an Oath of Allegiance to his Lawful Prince was his duty, and according to the Scriptures. And this plainly and naturally follows, whether the *Story* it ſelf be true or no. And accordingly my anſwer proceeds: —— 'They mention, and there- Anſw. 'by approve *Jaddus*'s anſwer to *Alexander*, that he had ſworn Allegiance pag. 11. 'to *Darius*, and therefore could not violate his Oath ſo long as *Darius* 'lived; and from thence we may conclude that their ſence is, That an 'Oath of Allegiance was binding to a Prince, ſo long as he lived, and 'had not given up his Right, tho he was beaten in the Field, and fled 'before his Enemies. —— Here our Author anſwers; *He was aware* Pag. 20. *how much their judgment would be preferr'd before his, where he differs from them: and therefore finding them againſt him in all he hath ſaid of the ſuſpitiouſneſs of the Story. He is now for compounding the matter as far as this Story will make on his ſide. He is content they ſhould believe it, provided they will give up that part of it, for which he hath rejected the whole, that is, he is content they ſhould take* Joſephus *for a good Author, only as far as his Authority makes for the Non-ſwearers. An eaſie Reader may be perſuaded to this, but not without ſhew of proof.* But where had our Author all this? There is not a word of it, nor any thing like it in my anſwer; My anſwer is before cited *verbatim*: and if any Reader (let him be *eaſie* or difficult) can find the leaſt Intimation of any one of all theſe fine things, I will be *contented* to own that our Author gives my Sence, when he ſays the clean contrary. And what I wonder has the ſence of the Convocation ariſing from a Story (true or falſe) which they have inſerted in their Book, to do with his *Compoſitions, Proviſoes*, Conditions, and Limitations? If Dr. *Sherlock* had the handling of this, He could have told him, 2. Vind. of the Caſe. pag. 71. *I deſire he would keep to my words, for I will anſwer for none of his Sences, unleſs I were better ſatisfied.* —— I ſhall not add the reſt, it being a ſtrain of

of Elocution peculiar to the Dr. and which I have no delight to Tranſcribe from him. In the mean time all I ſhall obſerve is, that no body knows the vertue of *Prefaces* and *Paraphraſes*, which, with a little Art, will make a man ſay any thing in the World, and whatſoever his Anſwerer pleaſes.

After this Introduction, our Author at length comes my Anſwer. *And* (ſays he) *therefore he tells you they of the Convocation mention, and thereby approve* Jaddus's *anſwer to Alexander*: That he had ſworn Allegiance to *Darius*, and therefore could not violate his Oath ſo long as *Darius* lived. *From hence the Objector infers, that their ſence is*, That an Oath of Allegiance was binding to a Prince ſo long as he lived, and had not given up his Right, tho he was beaten in the Field, and fled before his Enemies.--- To this he anſwers, *This is what the Objector would have*: Very well, if this be what I *would have*, why did not our Author anſwer it? is the mentioning of this anſwer of *Jaddus* an Evidence of their approbation of it, or no? But not a word of that, which notwithſtanding is the foundation of my Anſwer. And is not what they ſay in their Canon a further confirmation of it. 'If any Man ſhall affirm --- that *Jaddus* --- having ſo 'ſworn, he might lawfully have born Arms himſelf againſt *Darius*, or have 'ſollicited others whether *Aliens* or *Jews* thereunto: He doth greatly err. This I think is as fair a proof of their ſence of this Matter as need to be, and conſequently that the Doctrine before is their ſence. But tho our Author will not anſwer this, yet he doth not think ſo; and therefore tells us, *The ſence of the Convocation will beſt appear by their own* words. *And thus they go on with the Story.*--- [Alexander *by Gods Providence having vanquiſh'd the* Perſians, (that is, having overthrown *Darius* the King of the *Perſians* upon which the Monarchy of the *Grecians* began.) Theſe words within the Parentheſis are our Authors, not the *Convocations*. *The* Jews *among many other Nations became his Subjects. He dealt favourably with them, releas'd them of ſome Payments, and granted them Liberty to live according to their own Laws.* Our Author adds, *Theſe laſt are the words of* Joſephus *in that very Chapter which was quoted before in the Convocation-book, and the things here ſpoken were done by* Alexander *then, when he was at* Jeruſalem *two years before the Death of* Darius. *In Conſequence hereof the Convocation declare in their Canon, That* if any man ſhall affirm —— That the *Jews* generally both Prieſts and People, were not the *Subjects* of *Alexander* after his Authority was ſetled among them, as they had been before the Subjects of the King of *Babylon* and *Perſia* —— He does greatly err. In anſwer to this I have theſe things to obſerve.

Can. 30. pag. 65.

1. That which our Author cites here out of the Convocation is not from the Chapter in which the anſwer of *Jaddus* is mention'd, and thereby approv'd, nor yet from the Canon of that Chapter, but from another, and which is of a diſtinct Conſideration, and which plainly concerns, quite another

another ſtate of affairs than what they conſider in the foregoing Chapter and *Canon*. Now in the foregoing Chapter, they mention *Jaddus*'s anſwer to *Alexander* and approve of it; They likewiſe take notice of *Darius*'s *overthrow* by *Alexander*, and particularly at the end of *Jaddus*'s anſwer, they add as their own Remark. *Darius being by flight eſcaped, when his Army was diſcomfited*, i.e. *Darius* was alive tho beaten and overthrown; and therefore *Jaddus* could not agree to the Requeſt of *Alexander* without violating his Oath. And if any Man can make any other ſence of it, I ſhould be glad to ſee it. And this is the plain ſtate of this Matter in this Chapter: and then in the latter end of the Canon to the ſame Chapter, they intimate that *Jaddus* having *ſo ſworn*, it was unlawful for him to take up Arms againſt *Darius*, or *to perſuade others thereunto*: Now if this *Canon* refers to the Chapter, and 'tis ridiculous to think otherwiſe, then 'tis as plain as the Sun; that the Convocation thought his Oath bound *Jaddus not to take up Arms himſelf againſt* Darius, *nor to perſuade* others, when he was *overthrown* and *diſcomfited*, but yet ſo as he himſelf by *flight* had eſcaped. But here (according to Promiſe) I muſt conſider what Dr. *Sherlock* ſays, who makes ſome anſwer to this tho our Author doth not; and he ſaith, *The Convocation in their Canon take no notice, that* Jaddus *having ſworn to* Darius *could not ſubmit, or ſwear to any other Prince while* Darius *lived*. They do not ſay ſo indeed in ſo many words, but they are very particular in the Chapter; and in the Canon, they intimate, that by vertue of this Oath, he was not to take up Arms himſelf againſt *Darius*, nor to *ſollicit others*, *Jews* or *Aliens*. And if there be any Connexion between the *Canon* and the *Chapter*: it is plain, this refers to what they had ſaid concerning *Jaddus* and his anſwer in the Chapter; and the ſence is, that notwithſtanding the overthrow and diſcomfiture, they mention in the Chapter, yet *Darius* being himſelf eſcaped; The Obligation of his Oath to *Darius* held him, ſo as it was not lawful for him to take up Arms againſt *Darius*, nor ſollicit others; *i.e.* in the Circumſtances mention'd in the Chapter *when he was eſcaped by flight and his Army diſcomfited*. And this is plain and natural, and the *Chapter* and *Canon* are all of a piece, and the Contexture uniform, but to ſuppoſe that what they ſay relative to the *Oath* in the Chapter, and what they ſay *relative* to the ſame Oath in the Canon of the ſame Chapter, That they are of a diſtinct nature and Conſideration, is to ſuppoſe that the faireſt way of interpreting Men, is in contradiction to themſelves. Well, but the Doctor ſays, *It is plain* Jaddus *himſelf did not mean this by it, for he immediately ſubmitted to* Alexander *before the laſt fatal overthrow of* Darius —— *The meaning then of* Jaddus's *Anſwer to* Alexander, *was no more but this: That the having ſworn Allegiance to* Darius, *could not make a voluntary Dedition of himſelf to* Alexander, *which was the thing deſired*. This hath already been very well anſwered by a learned Pen, and thither I ſhall refer the Doctor, and the Reader, and ſhall only add,

Caſe of Alleg. p. 8.

Dr. *Sherlock's* Alleg. conſid. p. 2.

that what the Doctor gives as the Reaſon and meaning of *Jaddus*'s anſwer why he could not ſubmit to *Alexander*, was notwithſtanding the very thing, He did. He tells us the meaning was, *having ſworn to* Darius, *he could not make a* voluntary Dedition *of himſelf to* Alexander; and yet, however it came to paſs, this was the thing he did; He made a *voluntary Dedition* of himſelf to *Alexander*. For he deliver'd up himſelf, and the City, without either *Siege*, or *Stroke*, or *Summons*: and if ſo ſoon as an Enemy comes before a Town, the Governour and Inhabitants open the Gates, and deliver up the Keys, and themſelves, if this be not a *voluntary Dedition*, no man living knows what it is. And as to the *voluntarineſs* of it, it could not have been more *voluntary* if it had been done, when *Alexander* was before *Tyre*: there was indeed this difference, that *Alexander* demanded their Submiſſion then; but here was not ſo much as that. If therefore *Jaddus*'s Oath oblig'd him from a *voluntary* Dedition, then it oblig'd him from *that* Dedition, which is inconſiſtent with that very ſence of his Oath; which the Doctor makes to be his own meaning. And I will appeal to any Man, whether if a Governour of a City or Caſtle, had only taken a ſolemn Oath, not to make a *voluntary Dedition* of himſelf, (and yet an Oath of Allegiance is much more than that; but ſuppoſing only ſuch an Oath, whether in the Eſtimate of all Mankind, he would not be *perjur'd* if he ſhould act in the ſame manner, as *Jaddus* here by the Dr. and our Author is repreſented to have done. And ſo the Dr. hath finely mended the matter, and to ſave the Example of *Jaddus*; and to ſuit it to his purpoſe he hath prov'd him, and repreſents him, as a plain violater of his Oath, and that *formally* (according to the Doctors diſtinction) as acting againſt his own ſence and judgment of the Oath he had taken: and ſo at laſt he hath made a fair Example of it, and much good may it do him.

I now return to our Author, and to connect the Diſcourſe (which the anſwer to the Dr. hath a little interrupted.) We may remember that in anſwer to what he cited out of the Convocation; I ſaid, That it was taken out of another Chapter, and is of diſtinct Conſideration from that in which they mention the anſwer of *Jaddus*, and the overthrow of *Darius*. And therefore,

2. When they ſay in the next Chapter, as our Author cites them: Alexander *by Gods Providence having vanquiſh'd the* Perſians: *the* Jews *amongſt many other Nations became his Subjects*. By being *Vanquiſh'd*, can never be interpreted to mean the ſame *overthrow* and *diſcomfiture* of *Darius*, which they mention in the former Chapter; for notwithſtanding that, they ſtill ſuppoſe *Jaddus* the Subject of *Darius*, and that he ought not to take up Arms againſt hm, *&c.* But here in this Chapter, they ſuppoſe the *Jews, Prieſts and People*, Subjects to *Alexander* to all intents and purpoſes. Which plainly denotes a very great variation of

Cir-

Circumſtances. And therefore by *overthrow* in the former Chapter, they mean, and ſo expreſs it, when his Army was beaten, *but he was eſcaped*, and in that ſtate, Allegiance was due to him, and the force of *Jaddus*'s Oath remain'd. But by *Vanquiſhing* here, they mean a total and final ſubduing when *Darius* was kill'd, and the *Perſian* Monarchy at an end; and this plainly appears from the Expreſſions themſelves.

1. They ſay, Alexander *having vanquiſh'd the* Perſians, *the* Jews *became his Subjects:* whereas according to our Author's Notion, it ſhould have been ſaid, when *Alexander* had vanquiſh'd the *Jews*, they became his Subjects. It is plain enough therefore that they date the ſubjection of the *Jews*, not from any Victory, or Dedition of the *Jewiſh* Nation, but from the *vanquiſhing of the Perſians*, which plainly reſpects the deſtruction of that Monarchy: and it is not only a great force and ſtrain upon the word, but even contrary to common Sence; to ſay, the *Perſians* were *vanquiſh'd* when the King was living, in the Poſſeſſion of *Perſia* it ſelf, and a numerous and potent Army at his Heels. From whence 'tis plain enough, that the Convocation, expreſſing this, not by the ſubmiſſion of *Jaddus* and the People, but by the vanquiſhing of the *Perſians*, nor yet dating *Alexander*'s Government over them from any ſuch ſubmiſſion and conſent, but from the *vanquiſhing* aforeſaid, have no manner of reference to ſuch a Submiſſion, (and which is one Evidence they never believ'd it) but refer to quite another ſtate of Affairs than what they mention in the Chapter before, and conſequently by *vanquiſhing the* Perſians here, they do not mean the two Victories *Alexander* had over *Darius* before he receiv'd the anſwer of *Jaddus*, but the laſt fatal and concluding Battel, which put an end to *Darius*'s life, and to the *Perſian* Monarchy. And that they *only* meant this, is farther confirmed in that.

2. They ſay, the *Jews* (*among* many *other Nations*) became his Subjects. This plainly refers to the end of that Monarchy, and the death of *Darius*. When indeed *Alexander* had *many* Nations ſubjects to him; but not ſo before, and eſpecially at that time he is repreſented to come to *Jeruſalem*. His Conqueſts were then but of a ſmall extent to what they were afterwards. And put theſe together, the Convocation dates *Alexanders* Government over the *Jews* from his *vanquiſhing* the *Perſians*, and adds withall, That they became his Subjects among *many* other Nations. I think no man can reaſonably doubt but that they had an immediate Reſpect to the determining of the *Perſian* Monarchy, and ſeem plainly to mean that *Judea* followed the Revolution of that Empire, and became ſubject to *Alexander*, as the reſt of the Nations did upon the death of *Darius*.

An this is a plain Anſwer to what follows in our Author; I had ſaid, 'for the other part of the Story of *Jaddu*'s ſubmitting to *Alexander* while '*Darius* was living, the Convocation take no notice of it. He anſwers, P. 21. *They do not name* Jaddus *indeed: but what ſaith he to theſe words*, that the

Jews generally both *Prieſts* and People were the *Subjects* of *Alexander?* why truly I ſay nothing at all to them, for they do not concern the preſent Queſtion. Theſe words are in the Convocation, and if they thought that *Jaddus* was then living, they might mean him as well as any body elſe. But the Queſtion is, Whether they thought *Darius* then living, and *it does not appear any where that they thought ſo.* Our Author anſwers, *No! Doth it appear that they thought what they writ?* Yes ſure, but I muſt tell our Author, that will not be granted to every body, and I ſhould go near to fanſie that a Man that contradicts himſelf, twice in two or three lines does not *think* what he writes. For Proof of this he adds, *Their Book ſaith, He by flight eſcaped, when his Army was diſcomfited.* Right, but I have told him already they ſay it on another Occaſion, and with reſpect to another ſtate of Affairs: it is the ſubject of another Chapter, in which they plainly ſeem to approve *Jaddus*'s anſwer, which is a direct contradiction to our Author. And they add in their Canon to it; and which alſo plainly refers to it, that by vertue of his Oath to *Darius*, it was not lawful for him to take up Arms againſt *Darius*, nor to ſollicit others, *Jews* or Aliens. This addition of *Aliens* is very remarkable, there is not the like again in the whole Convocation, and it ſeems plainly to refer to *Alexander* or his Army, who at that time were in actual Arms againſt *Darius*, or at leaſt to the neighbouring Countries, who might be tempted to revolt from their King in his declining Condition, and take part with the Conqueror. However, this ſingular Expreſſion means ſomething. And when in this place only they add *Aliens*, it ſeems plainly to reſpect that juncture, and immediately to refer to the flight and diſcomfiture of *Darius* they had mention'd in the Chapter; and I ſhall refer it to any impartial Reader, whether he can make any other fair Conſtruction of it. In the Chapter they approve *Jaddus*'s reſolute anſwer to *Alexander*, that he could not yield to his demands, (viz. to *aſſiſt him in his Wars and become Tributary*) becauſe he had taken an *Oath* to *Darius* which he could not violate while *Darius* lived. And in the Canon they ſay, 'If any Man ſhall af-'firm,---- that *Jaddus* having ſo ſworn, might lawfully have born Arms 'himſelf againſt *Darius*, or have ſollicited others, whether *Aliens* or *Jews* thereunto, he does greatly err--- which plainly and in all points concurs with *Jaddus*'s anſwer; and is the very ſame thing in other words. He might not bear Arms himſelf, and therefore could not become the Subject of *Alexander*. He might not ſollicit *Aliens*, and therefore could not *aſſiſt* him in his Wars. And the *placing* of this deſerves conſideration; It is ſaid, firſt *Aliens*, and then *Jews*, which intimates, as if that was chief in the Eye of the Convocation, and which plainly runs parallel with *Jaddus*'s anſwer, and ſeems directly to refer to it, when he was requir'd to aſſiſt *Aliens* againſt his own King, *when he was eſcaped by flight, and his Army diſcomfited.* So that this Part of the Canon is nothing elſe, but the judg-

ment

ment of the Convocation concerning this Conduct of *Jaddus*, and they plainly determine that what he did, was but his duty, and what he ought to have done. From whence nothing is more plain than that it is the ſence of the Convocation, that it is not lawful for a Man to become ſubject, or to aſſiſt another prevailing Prince, if his own King be living, tho he be beaten in the Field, and fled before his Enemies. Our Author adds, *And though they do not ſay* Darius *was living when* Alexander *came to* Jeruſalem, *yet no learned Man can be ignorant, that he lived Two years after this.*

This Doctor *Sherlock* ſpeaks a little more to, and therefore I ſhall conſider it altogether. To what I ſaid, 'That the ſence of the Convocation 'is not to be extended beyond their words. —— The Doctor ſays, *This I grant:* But to the other Part, 'nor are they to be made Parties to any more 'of the Story than they have inſerted in their Book. He ſays, *This I deny*; and his Reaſon is, *For if they believ'd any of the Story upon* Joſephus's *Authority, for the ſame reaſon they muſt believe all, and if they paſs their judgment on a matter of Fact, ſuch wiſe men ought to be preſumed, to judge upon the whole matter of Fact, eſpecially when different Circumſtances will alter the nature of the Action.* Now this is true enough, but nothing at all to the purpoſe; for the *matter of Fact*, that the Convocation paſs their judgment on, they do conſider the whole of it; and that is the anſwer of *Jaddus* to *Alexander*. But the ſubmiſſion of *Jaddus* to *Alexander* afterwards is another Story, and not one and the ſame: and I do not ſee any reaſon why, becauſe they give their judgment on one matter of Fact, and ought therefore to be preſumed to judge upon the whole of *that* matter of Fact, therefore they ought to be preſumed to judge upon the whole of another matter of Fact, which they give no judgment, nor take any manner of notice of. If a Man quotes one Story out of an Hiſtorian, is he therefore preſently bound to anſwer for all the Stories the ſame Hiſtorian tells, tho they be in the ſame place, or refer to the ſame Perſon? and if he does not, muſt his Judgment and Wiſdom be call'd in queſtion? This is the Caſe here, the Convocation take one Story out of *Joſephus* concerning *Jadus*, and muſt they therefore be accountable for every thing *Joſephus* ſays of *Jaddus* in the ſame Chapter, tho they take no notice of it? A Man would imagine the Inference was the clean contrary; and that becauſe they take no notice of it, therefore they are not at all to be concern'd in it, nor intitled to it; their very pretermiſſion of it (when it lay ſo fair for them according to their Courſe and Method) one would think is a ſufficient reaſon of their diſlike of it. And it is ſomewhat hard that it muſt be father'd upon them, whether they will or no. Vindic. p. 19.

Well!

Well! But the Doctor adds, *According to our Author's Opinion it makes a great difference, in* Jaddus's *ſubmiſſion to* Alexander, *whether* Darius *were living or dead. And can we think ſuch wiſe men, as made up that Convocation, ſhould not conſider this? tho, as he ſays, they take no notice of it: and if they did conſider it, and took their Story from* Joſephus *(and it ſeems by him, they could have it from no other Author, it is plain they muſt believe* Darius *to be living when* Jaddus *who was his Subject, and had ſworn Allegiance to him, notwithſtanding this ſubmitted to* Alexander, *which ſhews what their Opinion was, That Subjects who had ſworn Allegiance to their Prince might yet, when under Force, as* Jaddus *was, become the Subjects of another prevailing Prince.* Now all this Reaſoning the Doctor confutes himſelf;

Vindic. p. 18. For thus he Prefaces what he has to Reply to the Caſe of *Jaddus*. *This I muſt ſay, that if they part with this Story, they loſe ſo glorious a Teſtimony (as they uſed to account it) to the indiſpenſable Obligation of an Oath of Allegiance, while the King to whom we have ſworn Allegiance lives, whether he be in poſſeſſion, or out of it.* Very well, then I ſuppoſe thoſe Men did believe *Darius*'s being *living or dead*, made a great difference with reſpect to *Jaddus*'s ſubmiſſion, and yet it ſeems they *did not conſider this*. And then it follows, that Men may take that Story from *Joſephus*, and argue from it, and yet not preſently be ſuppos'd to think *Darius* then living: and it is plain, no Man did think ſo, that made that Argument, and made uſe of that Teſtimony for that purpoſe: Well! but theſe I doubt are *ſome Men*, for the Doctor calls them --- *They*, and ſo perhaps may not come within the Character of *ſuch wiſe Men*. Well, but ſuppoſe the Doctor himſelf were one of thoſe Men, then I hope it is not ſo utterly impoſſible, but a wiſe Man may take that Story, and yet not conſider whether *Darius* was living. And to my knowledge the Dr. took this Story out of *Joſephus*, and argu'd upon it, and yet for all that did not then think that *Jaddus* confuted it himſelf; and truly, for any thing I know, no one elſe beſides himſelf then did ſo, tho he is now pleas'd to ſay, They *uſed to account it ſo glorious a Teſtimony*. And therefore the Doctor hath the leaſt reaſon of any Man to give this for an Anſwer; for if *Jaddus* himſelf hath *confuted* the Teſtimony, the Doctor himſelf hath *confuted* his *Anſwer*; for it is plain enough from his own Practiſe, that Men may take this Story from *Joſephus*, and yet not believe that *Darius* was living, when the *Jews* became Subjects to *Alexander*, for he himſelf did ſo; And why might not the Convocation do ſo, as well as he? And there is yet more reaſon for the Convocation, for the preſent Controverſie was not then on foot, nor the *de facto* Arguments in every Mans mouth, and in every Pamphlet; all which was the Caſe of the Doctor when he conſider'd *Joſephus*; and if in ſuch Circumſtances the Doctor could overlook all this, I hope the Convocation might

might do it, and yet be very *wiſe Men* too! And what wonder is it, if Men are not ſo very critical and punctual, in examining all the Circumſtances of a Story, what if they took the Story juſt as they found it as the Doctor did, without conſidering what *Joſephus* ſaid before or after, or without conſidering what *Arrian* and *Curtius* had ſaid, and comparing them with *Joſephus*? This is matter of every days obſervation, and the *wiſeſt* Men are often guilty of it. And ſuppoſe it was an overſight, muſt Men preſently be intitled to the Doctrines that are conſequential to thoſe very things which they have overſeen? We look into the Convocation, not for *Hiſtory*, but for *Doctrine*: And it is a pleaſant Buſineſs indeed, when we are inquiring into the ſence of the Convocation, we muſt have it from *Joſephus*, and not from the Convocation it ſelf. The plain Queſtion is, whether the Convocation did believe that *Darius* was living when the *Jews* (in their account) became Subjects to *Alexander*. Yes, ſaith the Doctor, *becauſe ſuch wiſe men ought to be preſum'd to judge upon the whole matter of Fact*. Yes, ſaith our Author, *becauſe no learned Man can be ignorant that he liv'd two years after this*. That is to ſay, you muſt take the ſence of the Convocation from the conſiderations and Collections that theſe Gentlemen think convenient, for them (whether they were concern'd in them or no) and if you intend to know the ſence of the Convocation, you muſt apply your ſelf to *Joſephus*, *Curtius* and *Arrian*, and diligently compare them together, and then you cannot miſs of it, which is a pure way of interpreting of Authors: Whereas I always thought that every Author was his own beſt Interpreter; and 'tis a ſtrain of Intepretation and fit only to ſerve ends and purpoſes, when Men will not take an Author as they find him; but beſides his own account will ſeek out for other matters, to ſquare and meaſure his ſence by: and 'tis plain enough, that theſe Gentlemen cannot make out their Point from the Convocation it ſelf, otherwiſe they would never have ſought out for forein Helps and Aſſiſtances: which in ſhort, is nothing elſe but to make a ſence for themſelves, but not to take it as they find it.

But this is not all, for the Doctor hath once more *confuted* his own Reaſonings here; for to my Anſwer, That this Story (as 'tis told by *Joſephus*) is an *exempt Caſe*, for that *Jaddus* had a *Revelation*, and ſo does not come within the Compaſs of the ordinary and ſtanding Rules the Dr. anſwers. *We are now diſputing about the ſence of the Convocation, and therefore muſt remember, that the Convocation does not aſſign this Reaſon, why* Jaddus *after his Oath to* Darius, *ſubmitted to* Alexander. Very good! And where then is the force of this Reaſon, *if they paſs their judgment on a matter of Fact, ſuch wiſe Men ought to be preſumed to judge upon the whole matter of Fact, eſpecially when different Circumſtances will alter the nature of the Action?* Vindic. p. 20.

on? I hope *Revelation* in this Caſe is a *different Circumſtance* that will alter the nature of the Action. And if the Doctor will not admit that to be the ſence of the Convocation, becauſe they do not aſſign it as a Reaſon, then *Joſephus*'s account of their ſubmiſſion is not their ſence, for neither do they aſſign that account of their becoming the Subjects of *Alexander*. But this matter we come now to debate; and here the Doctors Anſwer, and that of our *Author* is the very ſame; our Author indeed ſays a little more to it, and therefore I ſhall follow his Method.

Anſw. p. 12. My Anſwer is this, 'Grant the Story true, it is not to the purpoſe 'it is us'd for. *Joſephus* tells us, God appear'd to *Jaddus* in a Dream, 'and warn'd him to ſubmit to *Alexander*, and to meet him in that ſolemn 'manner he did. So that this is a ſingular and exempt Caſe, and falls 'within the Circumſtances of *Jehu* and *Ahud*.

Our Author puts off his Anſwer to this, and falls firſt upon an Objecti-
Pag. 23. on I had rais'd to it, and tells us, *He is aware that there is a prejudice againſt this, namely,* That Prophecy was then departed from the *Jewiſh* Church.
Mal. 4. 3. He anſwers, *This is certainly true,* Malachi *having given them warning, that the next Prophet that ſhould come would be* Elias. But the *Objector ſhifts off this by telling us, That* when there were no more Prophets, yet ſtill there was an inferiour degree of Prophecy, which laſted for a long time as the *Bath Kol,* and probably ſome other way, as by Dreams, *&c.*

He adds, *To make way for theſe: He tells us,* it was always the Cuſtom of the *Jewiſh* Church, in great Extremity, to have recourſe to God, for ſome expreſs Revelation what they ſhould do. To this he anſwers, *This is more than the* Jews *knew, or they did not think of it, at that time when* Judas Maccabæus *being ſlain, there was a great affliction in* Iſrael, *the like whereof was not* ſince the time that a Prophet was not ſeen among
1 Maccab. 9. 27. them, *for then they took mere human Counſels, without looking for any expreſs Revelation.* But that is more than our *Author* knows; and the Text intimates no ſuch thing. The Text ſaith indeed, *the like affliction was not ſince the time that a Prophet was not ſeen among them.* But that is but a
Antiq. l. 13. c. 1. Date of Time, and *Joſephus* himſelf interprets it, *ſo great a Calamity as was not ſince the* Babyloniſh *Captivity,* and yet there were Prophets among them ſince that, tho but few, and not of the ſame rank with thoſe before. And it is reaſonable ſo to interpret it; for the Text plainly reſpects, and refers to a great Affliction of the *Jewiſh* Nation, and ſuch as was Superiour to that Condition they then were in, and which cannot well be aſſign'd to be any other than their general Captivity: for there was no ſuch extraordinary change of their Affairs in the times of the *Perſian* Monarchy, and eſpecially at that time that *Malachy* the laſt of the Prophets is ſuppos'd to live. But however, ſuppoſe theſe words reſpected the laſt of the Prophets, and when there were no more ſucceeding in the *Jewiſh* Church.

Church? What then? might there not be an inferiour degree of Prophecy, and God might communicate his Will in an extraordinary manner, and upon extraordinary Occaſions? and that ſo communicated be a ſufficient Warrant and Direction to them? And therefore ſuppoſe they in that extremity took *meer human Counſels*, the *Jews* did that very often, when they had conſtant and ſtanding Prophets among them, and not only ſo, but even contrary to God's *expreſs Revelations* delivered by thoſe Prophets. As, beſides other places, is manifeſt in the Prophecies of *Ezechiel* and *Jeremiah*, and particularly in the Caſe of *Zedekiah*, and of the People flying into *Ægypt*. And what *meer human Counſels* were theſe that they took? Why truly, after the killing of *Judas Maccabæus*, they choſe *Jonathan* his next Brother to be their Captain and Ruler. And what difficulty was there in that? Or what need was there of *Divine Revelation*? Or what Reaſon had they to expect it in ſuch a Caſe? This was natural and proper, and there needed no eſpecial Direction in that matter: when they were in diſtreſs before under their own Kings, and when they had Prophets among them, when one King was dead, they did not apply themſelves to a *Prophet*, or wait for *expreſs Revelation* to ſet his Son or Heir on the Throne. Nor was there any need here, when it was in their own power, to chuſe whom they pleaſed, to wait for Divine Direction; for the Theocraſie was long ſince ceaſed, and they were at their Liberty. But it had been much more for our Author's purpoſe, if it could have been but prov'd, that while *Judas* had been living, and inſiſted on his Right to the Government, they had choſe him too, they ſhould have choſe another againſt his Conſent. This indeed would have been to take *meer human Counſels*, *i. e.* contrary to Divine Laws, and which indeed would have needed a *Divine Revelation* to juſtifie. But what need of ſuch a Revelation in an ordinary and ſtanding Caſe, and in which they had ſufficient means to direct themſelves.

But after all, the main point in queſtion is not in the leaſt ſpoken to, and our Author gives no Anſwer to it. And that is, *That when there were no more Prophets, yet there was an inferiour degree of Prophecy in the* Jewiſh *Church, as the* Bath Kol, *and probably ſome other way, as by Dreams*, &c. This our Author repeats, and then leaves it, as if it did not concern the Queſtion; and falls upon another thing concerning their Applications to God in extremity for ſome expreſs Revelation, and anſwers even that myſtically and obſcurely, that they did not know it, or not think of it in a particular inſtance. And what then, might there not be ſuch a thing in the *Jewiſh* Church for all that? And the Queſtion is plain before him; after the ceaſing of the Prophets, was there ſuch an inferiour Degree of Prophecy in the *Jewiſh* Church, or no? This he cannot deny, but yet will not own it, and ſeems to inſinuate, as if he

would have his Reader believe there was no ſuch thing. It was not indeed conſtant and ſtanding to the *Jewiſh* Church after the ending of the Prophets. And therefore could not ordinarily be applyed to, as the *Urim* and *Thummim*, and the Prophets. But that it was ſome times, and God in ſome Caſes did in an extraordinary manner manifeſt his Will to them, as far as I know, is diſputed by no Learned Man. And this is ſufficient for the purpoſe I mentioned it. And the plain Queſtion is, whether ſuch a Manifeſtation of the Divine Will, when ever, and upon what occaſion ſoever it was, was not a ſufficient Warrant for Practice, and would juſtifie their acting in ſuch Caſes againſt ordinary and ſtanding Rules? Which, I think, no Man will deny. I ſhall apply this preſently.

And accordingly I aſſerted, that *Joſephus* tells us here were all preparations to it, they faſted and prayed. Our Author anſwers, *In diſtreſs to faſt and pray, and to ſeek to God for Deliverance, hath been uſed in all Ages of the Church.* Right, but what follows? The next night God appeared to *Jaddus*, and ordered him ſo to do; I had added that, "As "we have the Story from *Joſephus*, ſo we muſt have it all from him, and he "tells us ſo expreſly, and God's Appearing and Command ſtands upon "the ſame Authority with all the reſt of the Story. Our Author anſwers, *Here he would make us believe we have a Wolf by the ears; for whether we admit or deny this we are in his danger either way.* Now the Argument I had urged, tho it was not in Mood and Figure, was a Dilemma, and to liken it to a Beaſt with *ears* is an Alluſion a little unphiloſophical. But our Author, I ſuppoſe, doth not mean with reſpect to the *ears*, but to the *danger*; for a *Wolf* is a *dangerous* Creature, eſpecially if a Man hath him by the *ears*, and do not hold him faſt. And therefore he goes on. *If we deny this part of the Story, why may not the Objector deny all the reſt? But if we admit it, then it is wholly beſides the purpoſe*; *for* (adds our Author) *ſays he* (*with his uſual Civility:*) If theſe Gentlemen will ſhew us any expreſs Revelation for what they do, as *Jaddus* had, then they ſay ſomething, but 'till they can ſhew that, this Example, if true, will do them no ſervice. Our Author anſwers, *He hath obliged me ſo much with this Complement, that I cannot chuſe but admit that there was an expreſs Revelation.* Well, I am glad I have *obliged* our Author, ſo as to admit of any thing that I ſay. This is the firſt time, and therefore I will not be behind hand, but give him thanks, and ſhould be glad, if I could meet with any other occaſion for it, before his Book is ended. But theſe Obligations upon *Complements* are of very ſhort continuance. For he immediately adds, : *But I cannot grant him his Conſequence, 'till I ſee how it follows from the Premiſſes.* Now a Man would have imagined, at firſt ſight, that the *Conſequence* was as clear as the Sun; for if *Jaddus* acted by Revelation, and *They* by ordinary and ſtanding Rules,

Rules, it plainly *follows*, that his Example neither reaches their Caſe, nor is for their purpoſe. But this our *Author* will not admit; for he adds, *In order to this he ſhould have told what Revelation it was* Jaddus *had, and what uſe it was for, and then have ſhewed that we have the like occaſion, before he had required us to ſhew the like Revelation. But ſince he is ſo ſhort in theſe things, I muſt be the longer in conſidering them more particularly.*

Firſt, Take every thing as the Objector would have it, that Jaddus *had a Revelation, that he ſhould* ſubmit *to* Alexander, *tho* Darius *was living, and notwithſtanding his Oath, by which* Jaddus *formerly thought he was bound to the contrary. If* Jaddus *was then in the right concerning the Obligation of his Oath to* Darius, *the thing that he was now put upon, was the horrible Sin of Rebellion aggravated with perjury, and whatever elſe the Objector thinks fit to load his Brethren with, only this of* Jaddus *he tells us was* an exempt and ſingular Caſe, *for he was put upon it by Divine Revelation.* Very well! and this anſwers all that black Charge our Author hath ſo formally drawn up, and is plainly implyed and ſuppoſed in my Anſwer: and our Author admits it too; and what then, I wonder, made him make ſuch a formal Harangue about nothing. I ſuppoſe becauſe (as he ſays) I had been ſo *ſhort*, therefore he would be the *longer*. Well! but tho that might do well enough for *Jaddus*, yet it will not ſerve for the people: for he adds: *But even in this Caſe there would have been ſomething elſe neceſſary to engage the People to go along with him in this ſubmiſſion; for ſince now they are to look for no Prophet more, till the coming of* Elias, *as* Mala- Chap. 4. 5.
chi *told them, but were left under a ſtrict charge to* remember the Law of *Moſes* with the Statutes and Judgments. *This Change of their Allegiance from* Darius *to* Alexander, *being, as the Objector will have it, Rebellion and Perjury, than which nothing can be more contrary to the Law of God, how could* Jaddus *hope to bring them to this, by telling them only that he had a Revelation from God! He could not pretend to it, without making himſelf as great a Prophet as theſe were by whom theſe Precepts were given. And then he muſt prove it, by ſhewing ſuch ſigns as thoſe former Prophets did. Otherwiſe the* Jews *were ſo far from being bound to believe him, that they were to look on him as a falſe Prophet, and as ſuch to put him to death. We ſee how ready the* Jews *were to execute this upon our Saviour, as oft as he ſeemed to teach any thing contrary to their Law, tho he did prove himſelf a Prophet by working of Miracles. But* Joſephus *doth not tell us that* Jaddus *did any Miracle: (if he had we ought not to have believ'd him) and yet the* Jewiſh *Church at that time was ſo far from ſtoning* Jaddus *for pretending this Revelation, that they all joyned with him, in ſubmitting to* Alexander, *even while* Darius *was living. And therefore we may be ſure, that this Revelation was not againſt their* common and ſtanding Rules; *as our Objector will have it.*

In anſwer to this I have theſe things to ſay:

1. Our Author's Argument is equally valid againſt all Prophets and Prophecy among the *Jews* ſince the promulgation of the Law of *Moſes*, as againſt this inferiour Degree of Prophecy now before us. He does not quote the Text, nor yet refer to it, I ſuppoſe, leaſt the Reader ſhould conſult it, and plainly perceive the inconſequence of his Argugument, it is (*Deut.* 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.) the Sum of which is, *If there ariſe a Prophet, or Dreamer of Dreams, and giveth a ſign or a wonder, and the ſign or the wonder come to paſs whereof he ſpake unto thee, ſaying, Let us go after other Gods, and ſerve them, thou ſhalt not hearken unto that Prophet, for the Lord your God proveth you —— And that Prophet ſhall be put to death*, &c. Now our Author tells us, that Jaddus *could not pretend to a Revelation* (*contrary to the Law of God*) i. e. (contrary to ordinary and ſtanding Rules) *without making himſelf as great a Prophet as thoſe were by whom theſe Precepts were given*, and of *proving it by ſhewing ſigns and miracles*. Whereas 'tis plain enough the Text makes no difference in that, but expreſly declares the contrary. And let men pretend themſelves to be what Prophets they pleaſed, even as great as *Moſes*, and work Signs and Wonders, and which accordingly ſhould come to paſs, yet if they taught them to ſerve other Gods, they were not to be believed but to be put to death. And what then? therefore they might not act againſt ordinary and ſtanding Rules in particular Caſes, when God hath declared his Will by Prophets, or by other Revelation. This is a pure Conſequence; our Author's Argument equally reſpects Prophets and Miracles, as any other Revelation; and tho its true, none of theſe were ſufficient warrant to ſerve other Gods, yet 'tis plain enough they were to act againſt the ordinary Rules, as in the Caſe of the *Iſraelites*, ſpoiling the *Ægyptians*, and in the Caſe of *Joram* and *Jehu*, had the People, of their own Heads, ſet up *Jehu*, and kill'd *Joram*, it had been *Perjury* and *Rebellion*, and our Author muſt own it; but when God had declared his Will by his Prophet, they ceaſed to be ſo, which notwithſtanding without ſuch a Revelation would ſtill have retained their criminal Nature. And therefore,

2. I would ask our Author one plain Queſtion, whether Divine Revelation, which way ſoever it is manifeſted, be not a ſufficient Warrant to act againſt ſtanding and ordinary Rules? And it would be a pleaſant thing if any Man ſhould deny it. 'Tis true indeed, it being againſt theſe ſtanding Rules, may (in fit Circumſtances) be a reaſon to believe that 'tis *Enthuſiaſm*, Deluſion, or Temptation, and no Divine Revelation; but when the *Revelation* is granted (as our Author grants it) to talk of *Miracles, Stoning*, and I cannot tell what, is mere wandring and fancy, and nothing at all to the purpoſe. And as *Joſephus* tells the Story, 'tis plain enough that *Jaddus* himſelf, and the People were ſufficiently ſatisfied of the Truth of the Revelation, and accordingly immediately complyed

plyed with it, and upon confidence of it presently opened their Gates, and put themselves into the power of *Alexander*; whom they knew to be an enraged Enemy; which they never would have done, if they had not confided in the truth of the Revelation. So that the whole Question returns to this, Could the *Jewish* Church in those days have any *Divine Revelation?* Or was it against their constant and standing Rules that they should have any? This indeed our Author's Argument seems to drive at, when he tells us, *they were to look for no Prophet more, but were left under a strict charge to observe the Law of* Moses, *&c.* But then this is an Argument not only against the Uses and Ends of this *Revelation* (which is the Controversie between us) but against any *Revelation* at all, (which our Author allows.) If indeed there was no *Revelation*, nor could be at that time according to *their* Law, when all Prophecy was closed up with *Malachi*, then our Author's *Uses*, and mine, and *Josephus*'s are all alike. But if there was, then 'tis plain there was an *inferiour Degree of Prophecy* continued to the *Jewish* Church after there were no more Prophets, and here my *Dilemma* turns upon him, either there was such a *Divine Revelation*, or there was not; if there was, then it was a sufficient Warrant for Practice against ordinary and standing Rules, and all our Author's Arguments here signifie nothing. If there was not, then *Josephus* is mistaken in his Story, and as our Author says, *If we deny this part of the Story, why may not the Objector deny all the rest?* And so our Author hath his *Wolf by the ears* still, and he may either hold him, or let him go as he pleases. But

3. Our Author makes a great difficulty of it, how the People should believe *Jaddus*, and says, *How could* Jaddus *hope to bring them to this?* and especially not *pretending himself as great a Prophet as those by whom the Precepts were given*, and not *shewing Signs or Miracles, or if* Josephus *had said he had, we ought not believe him.* Now truly if there was any such thing, what Methods *Jaddus* had to make them believe it, or what Evidence he gave of the Revelation, *Josephus* is silent. But it seems (as he tells it) they did believe it, and upon that belief, ventured their Lives to the mercy of a Prince who had vowed Revenge on them. And I would fain see a Reason why they might not as well believe it to warrant their Practice, as to encourage their Hopes; for if it was a *Divine Revelation*, (and they believ'd it as such as 'tis plain they did) it would do one as well as the other. And I suppose their Consciences, under the Direction of a Divine Revelation, were in no more hazard, than their Lives.

At last our Author tells us, *These words upon which all the Argument moves, were thrust in by the Objector, namely, the words* to submit, *and that we shall find nothing in* Josephus *of any Revelation that* Jaddus *had to* submit, and to meet *Alexander. There was no occasion for it, for thus far he had determined already, before the Prayer and Fasting upon which he had the Revelation.* Pag 26.

Revelation. Theſe are Joſephus *his Words, Alexander* having taken *Gaza*, made haſte to go up to *Jeruſalem*; the *High Prieſt* Jaddus, upon hearing of this was, in an agony of fear, being at his Wits end to think how he ſhould meet the *Macedons*, the King being angry at his Diſobedience formerly. *It ſeems he was reſolved to have no more anger on that account, but to make his peace by an humble ſubmiſſion, and therefore he was in care how to* meet the *Macedons*, ſaith *Joſephus*, *who thus goes on:* Having therefore ordered the People to make Supplications, and himſelf with them offering Sacrifice to God, he beſought him to protect the Nation, and to deliver them from the imminent Dangers. *It is plain, that theſe were Prayers for a Deliverance, and not for a Revelation as the Objector is pleaſed to ſay. But was there not a Revelation after this? Yes it follows, That* after the Sacrifice, when he was gone to Bed, in his ſleep, God bade him be of good courage, and let them crown the City, and open their Gates. And for their *Meeting, (which they had reſolved before, but were in care how to do it, ſo as might move the King's favour and compaſſion)* Let them go *(ſays he)* the reſt in white Garments, but he with the Prieſts in thoſe Veſtments which the Law hath preſcribed, and be confident they ſhall ſuffer no evil, for that God will provide for them. And then our *Author* adds, *Here is every word of the Revelation.*

In anſwer to this I have theſe things to obſerve:

1. That our *Author* tells me, *I thruſt in the words upon which all my Argument moves, namely to* ſubmit, *of which there was nothing in the Revelation* mentioned by *Joſephus*, and yet, however it comes to paſs, our Author has *thruſt* them in himſelf; for he tells us Jaddus *was reſolved to make his peace by an humble* Submiſſion. And how does he prove this? why Jaddus *being in an agony, and at his wits end how to* meet Alexander, *and as for their* Meeting *that they had reſolved before.* But where is *Submiſſion* all this while? Why 'tis included in the *Meeting*; and *Jaddus* was reſolved to *ſubmit* to, becauſe he was reſolved to *meet, Alexander.* And is not this a very pleaſant Buſineſs? if they *reſolve* to *meet* him themſelves, then it means *Submiſſion*; but if God commands them to *meet* him, then *to ſubmit* is *thruſt* in by the Objector. But

2. How does our *Author* prove that *Jaddus* reſolved to *ſubmit* to *Alexander* before the *Revelation?* Why he offers at it by what *Joſephus* ſays, relating to Matters before the *Revelation*; and by what he ſays, as he reports the Revelation it ſelf: but neither of them are to his purpoſe.

1. What *Joſephus* ſays before the Revelation, that is, when *Jaddus* heard of *Alexander's* haſtening to *Jeruſalem, he was in an agony, and at his wits end how he ſhould* meet *the* Macedons, *the King being angry at his Diſobedience formerly.* From whence our *Author* concludes, that *he was reſolved to have no more anger on that account, but to make his peace by an humble*

humble Submiſſion. Or, as Doctor *Sherlock* renders it, *to attone for his former contumacy by an early ſubmiſſion.* But how does this follow from the words of *Joſephus?* For as the Learned Author, above-mentioned, hath very well obſerved, the word here uſed by *Joſephus* (ἀπαντῆσαι) may be taken in a *hoſtile* ſignification; and the (πῶς ἀπαντήσει τοῖς μακεδόσιν) may be rendred not how he ſhould *ſubmit*, but how he ſhould *fight* with the *Macedons.* And ſo it is uſed in S. *Luke* (*ch.* 14. *v.* 31.) *whether he be able with ten thouſand to meet* him (ἀπαντῆσαι) that cometh againſt him with twenty thouſand. And this is yet farther confirmed, for that *Joſephus* himſelf uſes it in the ſame ſenſe in this very Chapter, when he tells us that *Darius* hearing that *Alexander* had paſſed the *Helleſpont*, and at *Granic.* had conquered his Lieutenants, having gathered an Army of Foot and Horſe (ἀπαντῆσαι διαγνοῖς τοῖς μακεδόσι) determin'd to *meet* the *Macedons* before they had ſubdued all *Aſia.* Now, I ſuppoſe, no Man thinks that when *Darius* determined (as in our *Author*'s phraſe was *reſolved*) *to* meet Alexander, it was with intentions of *Submiſſion*, and to yield up his Crown to him, or in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Language, to *attone for his former contumacy*, in having reſiſted his entrance upon his Kingdom, but in plain *Engliſh* to *fight* with him. Now I would fain know why the *ſame* word in the *ſame* Author, and in the *ſame* Chapter is not alſo to be underſtood in the *ſame* ſenſe? And that which yet farther confirms this, is

Vindic. p. 20.

Antiq. l. 11. c. 8.

1. That *Joſephus* plainly alters the Expreſſion, when he mentions their *meeting* of *Alexander* by the Command of God in the Revelation, and it is not there that God commanded him (ἀπαντῆσαι,) but ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ὑπάντησιν) and afterwards upon *Jaddus*'s actual *Meeting*, he expreſſes it ποιούμενόν τὴν ὑπάντησιν, which is both a differing Expreſſion, and a differing Sence, for ὑπαντάω ſignifies to meet another *Honoris gratiâ*, out of deference and honour to him, and ſuppoſes Duty and Submiſſion. And ἀπαντάω the contrary. However I build nothing upon the Criticiſm. But the Expreſſion being varied by *Joſephus* himſelf, is a plain proof that he meant two things, and it is not very accountable how he ſhould alter his Words, and yet mean the *ſame* thing.

2. That which further confirms this Interpretation is, that *Joſephus* ſays *Jaddus* was in an agony how he ſhould *meet* not *Alexander*, but the *Macedons*, in the plural number, whereas had the Buſineſs been (as our Author and the Dr. fancy) Attonement and Supplication, it ſhould have been, how he ſhould *meet Alexander* or the King, for, I hope, *Jaddus* did not intend to ſupplicate the whole Army. But when it is ſaid to *meet* the *Macedons*, it plainly means the *Army* of *Macedons* in the ſame ſenſe *Joſephus* ſays before, that *Darius* determined to *meet* the *Macedons*, i.e. their *Army*, and to ſtop their Progreſs. And indeed in this

ſenſe

ſenſe there was reaſon enough for *Jaddus* to fear, how he ſhould hinder the Approaches of a victorious Army, and defend himſelf and the City from them that had beaten *Darius* in the Field, and but juſt before had made ſuch terrible Work at *Tyre* and *Gaza*. And acccordingly (as *Joſephus* tells it) they took a proper courſe, and applyed themſelves to God by Faſting and Prayer, and beſought him for *Protection* and *Deliverance*, and not as our *Author* would fain have it, that their *Submiſſion* (which they had *reſolved* on before) might be acceptable in the Eyes of *Alexander*, or that they might be recommended to his favour. Well, but does not *Joſephus* tell us, that the *King was angry at his former Diſobedience* (or rather *imperſuability or ſtiffneſs* in not yielding to *Alexander* to become his Tributary, *&c.* when he ſent to him; for that ſenſe, ἀπείθεια will bear, and is more agreeable to the Story.) Right, and therefore there was the more reaſon of fear, apprehending himſelf not able to reſiſt. But as our Author hath handled the matter, all this terrible Fright was for nothing elſe, but leſt his Submiſſion ſhould not be accepted: and ſo as our *Author* repreſents him, *Jaddus* had made a fair Game on't, he ſends a fooliſh Anſwer to *Alexander*, and then was *at his wits end* how to attone and make amends for it. Well, I perceive this very *Cluthæan Sanballat* took a much better courſe, for (as *Joſephus* hath it) he went early to *Alexander*, and carried with him eight thouſand Men, and was received with Honour and Favour, and yet *Joſephus* does not ſpeak very commendably of that Action, and can hardly forbear calling him a Traitor for his pains. But it ſeems, as our Author interprets *Joſephus*, he muſt be much the wiſer, yea, and the honeſter Man. For it ſeems *Sanballat* took time by the foretop, and did his Duty *early*, but *Jaddus* was forced to an after-reckoning, and *at his wits end* how to heal up the Diſobedience of his former Anſwer. I wonder what Notions ſome Men have of Virtue, Honour, or Conſcience: is it agreeable to any of theſe for a Governour of a Town, (and eſpecially for ſuch a one who hath taken an Oath of Fidelity to his Prince) to deliver it up ſo ſoon as the Enemy appears before it, and not only ſo, but to be in extreme Agonies and Perplexities for not having done it before? And I would appeal to all the World, whether *Batis*, who ſo gallantly defended *Gaza* againſt *Alexander*, tho he loſt his life in the Attempt, was not more faithful to his Maſter, and perform'd his Duty with more Honeſty, as well as Courage, than *Sanballat* (as *Joſephus* delivers it) who made a plain defection from him, or than *Jaddus*, either according to the Account that our Author, and Dr. *Sherlock* have given of him. I know Doctor *Sherlock* ſays, That *Jaddus* by his Anſwer meant no more, but that he would not make a *voluntary Dedition* of himſelf, that is to ſay, he performs all the parts of an honeſt and faithful Governour, that does not give up himſelf to an Enemy that is fifty Miles off, and only ſends a Meſſage

Caſe of Alleg. p.

Meſſage to him, but if he comes himſelf with an Army, 'tis honourable and faithful, and the Town and People are all his own. And yet as ridiculous as this is, if it were granted him, it will not ſolve the buſineſs: For he tells us, *That Jaddus his Care was how he might attone for his former Contumacy*, i. e. the *Contumacy* of his former Anſwer. Now to *attone* for any Action, implies the *renouncing* it; and ſo *Jaddus*, it ſeems, *renounced* his Anſwer, (as the Dr. hath ſome of his Principles) and took care to make timely Satisfaction by an *early Submiſſion*. But then what becomes of *Voluntary Dedition*? Why perhaps the Doctor might mean he would not go of himſelf till he was *ſent* for. And ſo we have an admirable Character of a good Governour, his *Oath* and his *Honour* oblige him to keep the City or Country till he is *asked the Queſtion*, and Conquerors muſt be cruel and hard-hearted indeed, if they will not vouchſafe to *ſend* for a Surrender. And yet at this fine rate do theſe Gentlemen treat *Jaddus*, and to magnifie his Example, and to fit it to their purpoſe, make him one of the *meaneſt* and *moſt contemptible* Perſons in the World. *Vindic. p.* 20.

2. I come now to conſider, how our Author proves *Jaddus* was reſolv'd to *ſubmit* to *Alexander* before the *Revelation*, from the Report *Joſephus* makes of that *Revelation*, and here our *Author* tells us, that *after the Sacrifice, when he was gone to bed, in his ſleep, God bad him be of good courage, and let them crown the City, and open their Gates.* And for their *Meeting* (which (ſays our *Authour*) they had reſolv'd before, but were in care how to do it, ſo as might move the King's Favour or Compaſſion) *Let them go, the reſt in white Garments, and he with the Prieſts in the Veſtments the Law hath preſcrib'd*, &c. Now here we have a pure ſtrain of Interpretation, and plainly ſhews, how our *Authour* can ſay any thing that makes for his purpoſe. The whole ſtreſs of our *Author*'s Argument, is to make it appear, that (according to *Joſephus*) *Jaddus* had reſolv'd to ſubmit to *Alexander* before he had any *Revelation* from God commanding him ſo to do. And then to make *Joſephus* ſay ſo, he turns his words upſide down, and puts in what he pleaſe, and places them as he ſees good, without either Order or Truth; and then indeed it is ſomewhat hard, if upon ſuch a Liberty, a Man cannot make *Joſephus* ſay what he hath a mind to.

And here, as he hath placed the Words and put in his own Additions, he would make his *Reader* believe, that *Joſephus* repreſented it, as if he had already concluded to meet *Alexander* in a poſture of Submiſſion; whereas there is no ſuch thing in *Joſephus*, nor any thing like it: Here he ſays, *And for their* Meeting; and from thence infers, they were reſolv'd to do it before; whereas both *for* their meeting, and the placing of it (which plainly alters the Senſe) is purely his own; all that *Joſephus*

Γ χρημάτισεν ὁ θεὸς θαρρεῖν, καὶ στεφανοῦν τὰς τὴν πόλιν, ἀνοίγειν τὰς πύλας, καὶ τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν ἄλλως λευκαῖς ἐσθῆσιν, αὐτὸν δὲ μὴ μὴν ἱερέων τῆς νομίμοις στολαῖς ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ὑπάντησιν.

says, is, that *God bad him be of good courage, and to crown the City and open the Gates, and the reſt in white Garments, but him, with the Prieſts, in the Veſtments which the Law preſcrib'd,* (or legal Veſtments) *to meet* him. And where, now I wonder, is this; *And* for *their Meeting*, which our *Author* begins the matter with, tho *Joſephus* placed it laſt, and from whence he would fain conclude, that this Meeting was reſolv'd on before; whereas 'tis plain enough, by the placeing of theſe Words in *Joſephus*, and by the connecting the Sentence by Conjunctives, that the ſame Command that bad him be of good courage, bad him alſo to *meet* him: But this would not ſerve our *Author*'s turn, and therefore he is for beginning at the latter end, and not only ſo, but for putting in Words of his own. He tells indeed *here is every word of the Revelation*, Right, and ſomewhat more to, even ſome Words of our *Author*, and theſe very Words of the *Revelation* are put out of their order, which make a new Senſe of them, and the very thing in controverſie is plainly, if not induſtriouſly perverted. Is there no difference with our *Authour* between God's commanding them to be of good courage and to *meet* him, and bidding him be of good courage, and *for their meeting*? But if *Joſephus* is not for our *Authour*'s purpoſe, he hath an Art to make him; 'tis but ſlipping in a *Particle*, and placing his Words to the beſt advantage, and then he may do very well; and whether he ſpeaks his own Senſe or no, he ſhall be ſure to deliver our *Author*'s Senſe.

The Sum of all this matter is contain'd in theſe two Queſtions, 1. Whether a Divine Revelation be not a ſufficient warrant to practiſe contrary to ordinary and ſtanding Rules? 2. Whether, as *Joſephus* tells the Story, *Jaddus* had not a Divine Revelation authorizing and appointing his and the Peoples particular Behaviour in this matter; it is plain enough, that the whole Action (as *Joſephus* relates it) was directed by God himſelf; the *Habit*, the *Solemnity*, the *Meeting*, all were of Divine Appointment: But theſe Gentlemen would fain confine the *Revelation*, to the Manner only, and not to the *Meeting* it ſelf; as if the ſame Revelation that directed them to *meet Alexander* in their Pontificalibus, and in that ſolemn manner, did not as well direct the *Meeting* as the *Manner* of it. And it is a pure Conſequence, God directed them to *meet* in ſuch a *Manner*, and therefore he directed the *Manner*, and not the *Meeting*: Juſt as if a Maſter ſhould command a Servant to put on ſuch a Habit, and attend on another Perſon; why truly he commands him to put on his beſt Cloaths, but as for his *Attendance*, he may do as he ſees good, his Maſter's Command does not extend to that. And therefore I would ask theſe Two *Authors*, Whether *Meeting* be not in the Revelation? And then I would fain ſee a reaſon, why the Revela-

tion

tion does not extend to the *Meeting*, as well as to all the reſt. Well, Dr. *Sherlock* hath one thing yet behind, and he tells us, that *When God is ſaid to appear to him* (Jaddus) *in his Dream, he anſwered no Queſtion about the lawfulneſs of ſubmitting to* Alexander; which is a very pleaſant Reaſon to come from Dr. *Sherlock*. My Anſwer is, that *Jaddus* (as *Joſephus* relates it) acted by Divine Revelation, and not by ordinary and ſtanding Rules, and the Dr. tells us, God anſwered no Queſtion about the *Lawfulneſs*, that is to ſay, God did not declare it to be an *ordinary* and *ſtanding* Rule for practice; for to *anſwer the Queſtion about the Lawfulneſs* of a thing, is reſolving a Caſe of Conſcience which hath reſpect to an antecedent Law: And therefore I muſt needs own, that *God anſwered no Queſtion about the Lawfulneſs of Submitting*, which, indeed, would have been declaring it to be lawful, and either making it, or elſe referring to, an ordinary Rule; but for all that, God, by revealing it to be his Will, made it lawful to them. When God commanded *Abraham* to ſacrifice his Son, he anſwer'd no Queſtion about the *Lawfulneſs* of ſuch Sacrifice; when he commanded the *Iſraelites* to ſpoil the *Egyptians*, he anſwered no Queſtion about the *Lawfulneſs* of their taking their Jewels and Goods from them; when, notwithſtanding, by virtue of a Divine Revelation, thoſe reſpective Actions were lawful, and a Duty to them, which otherwiſe would have been utterly unlawful. And it is very pleaſant to talk of a Revelation anſwering the Queſtion about the Lawfulneſs, when the Lawfulneſs it ſelf depends upon the Revelation. *Vindic.* p. 20.

At laſt our *Author* comes to another Objection, which he tells me, *He thinks it was put out of its place, and ought to have come in for a Reſerve*, and ſuch like Reflections. Now I will not ſtand with our *Author* upon this Point; if he does not like my placing my own Objections, let him place them himſelf, according as he can beſt anſwer them; all that I deſire is, that he will anſwer them, and as to his Method, firſt or laſt, it is all one to me, I will not quarrel with him in Dr. *Sherlock*'s Language, and tell him of *more Art than Honeſty in altering my Method and Order*: For I am contented to take Anſwers, let them come in what Method they will. Part of the Objection, as our *Author* repeats it, is this, 'The Practice of the High Prieſt in that corrupt ſtate of the *Jewiſh* Church, will not ſignifie much to us, and no more in this, than in their other Immoralities.——upon which our *Author* thus animadverts, *This was frankly ſaid, but I think not very ingeniouſly*. And why ſo, I pray? Did not I give an Inſtance immediately of *Eliaſhibs* building a Chamber in the Temple for *Tobiah*; and where is the *frankneſs* or *diſingenuity*? That which is *frankly* ſaid, is without proof, and that which is *diſingeniouſly* ſaid, is without truth. But here I had prov'd the Point, and in an Inſtance our *Author* cannot deny: p. 28. *Vindic.* p. 1. *Anſw.* p. 11. *Nihum.* 13. 4.

But he is not for mentioning that, and taking things altogether, but he likes cutting an Objection into halves, nay into quarters, as we ſhall ſee preſently, and then diſputing upon it. Now tho our *Author* likes his own Method beſt in anſwering my Objections, yet methinks he might have taken all the Objection along with him, and not have minc'd it and divided it, and not only ſo, but have left out a great part of it, when notwithſtanding 'tis all of a piece, and the ſtrength of it appears when 'tis united. But of all the Diſputers I ever met with, I never ſaw ſuch a one as our *Author*, who is for ſnatching and catching, and in the whole of his Anſwer, hath not taken one ſingle Paragraph, ſcarcely one Reaſon intire, and yet talks as magiſterially and dogmatically as if he had anſwer'd every word. And beſides what hath been obſerv'd before, the *Reader* may have yet a further taſte of our *Author*'s faculty in the matter before us; now what he here pretends to diſpute againſt is, a ſummary Concluſion from one part of the Diſcourſe, and it lies thus in my Anſwer. 'An Argument from Example is at beſt but 'a poor one, but it muſt be very poor indeed, when the Example it ſelf 'is doubtful. The practice of the High-Prieſt in that corrupt ſtate of 'the *Jewiſh* Church, will not ſignifie much to us, and no more in this, 'than in their other Immoralities. And *Jaddus* becoming a Subject to '*Alexander* contrary to his Oath, is no more a Pattern for us to follow, 'than *Eliaſhib*'s building a Chamber in the Temple for *Tobiah*, is an Ar-'gument for us to act contrary to the expreſs Law of God. But then 'it muſt needs ſignifie much leſs, when that practice wants ſufficient 'clearneſs and evidence to prove it.——Now if our *Author* had put this altogether, and taken it as he found it, his Animadverſions of *(putting this out of its place,)* would have appear'd very pleaſant; for where, I wonder, could this have been ſo pertinently brought in, as to confirm my Inference from the ſuſpiciouſneſs of that Example: And it would have been very proper indeed to talk of an Example according to ordinary Rules, after the conſideration of the *peculiar and exempt Caſe* of Divine Revelation. For let the Practice be evident or not evident, let that ſtate of the *Jewiſh* Church be corrupt or not corrupt, if they acted by Divine Revelation, it does not come under common and ordinary Conſideration, and conſequently does not at all affect that Argument. And (by his favour) that ought to have been ſpoke to when I was ſpeaking of ordinary Caſes. It is plain enough therefore that our *Author*'s Animadverſion was not to correct my Method, but to make way for his own; he could not tell how to ſpeak to this in its proper place, for then he muſt either have anſwerd it all, or at leaſt have mention'd it, and therefore, forſooth, it is *put out of its place*, that is to ſay, our *Author* hath *put it out of its place* for his own purpoſe, and not only ſo, but out of its *ſenſe* too, for the force of it lies in the Connection. *An Argument from Example*

Anſw. p. 11.

is

is a poor one, especially a suspicious Example; and this confirm'd by an Instance, *The Practice of the High-Priest in that corrupt state of the* Jewish *Church, signifies no more than their other Immoralities, and* Jaddus's *Submission no more than* Eliashib's *building a Chamber in the Temple for* Tobiah, *&c.* And if this had been mention'd together, our *Author*'s Answer would have been much to the purpose; for he tells us,

He speaks as if Jaddus *were single in this act of Submission, when it is evident, that the whole Church of God, at that time, went along with him*; and p. 29. suppose it, what then? Is an Example from a corrupt state of a whole Church a better Argument for practice than the Example of the High-Priest? To prove his Point, he might, if he had pleas'd, have produc'd the *Israelites* worshipping the *Golden Calf*. But to shew our *Author* the Vanity of his Method, I answer, as *Josephus* tells the story, they acted by *Divine Revelation*, and therefore let it be *Jaddus* himself, or the whole Church, 'tis all one, neither of them are an Example for us, when their Case and Circumstances were peculiar and extraordinary. And by this time, I suppose our *Author* sees, who hath *put this out of its place.*

Well! Our *Author* adds, *he tells us* of that corrupt state of the *Jewish* Church in *Jaddus*'s time: Our *Author* answers, *This is News*; that is to say, our *Author* never heard of it before; I am sorry for that; for I thought that the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, the *minor Prophets*, yea, and *Josephus* too, might have a little inform'd him about that matter. Well, but our *Author* says, *All ancient Writers speake of these times, as the best that ever were under the second Temple.* Now methinks our *Author* should have oblig'd his *Readers* with one of these *antient Writers* at least: But no such matter, if you will have them, you must look them your self, for he has not named one, no not so much as refer'd to one in the Margent, and yet to tell us *all* antient Writers speake so, is somewhat extraordinary. Now I must earnestly desire our *Author*, for the credit of this peremptory Assertion, that he will be pleased to name one *antient Writer* that ever said so, or any thing like it; and if he cannot do that, (as I am bold to say, I utterly despair of) that he will name some *modern* Writer; and if he cannot do that neither, this must go for a bold Stroke. For when a Man calls in *All* Writers to his assistance, the incredulous World are apt to think themselves impos'd upon, if he has not so much as *one single* Writer ready at hand to justifie what he says. And therefore, once again, I must press our *Author*, for his own sake, to make this out by plain proof from any one Writer, besides himself, in all the World. I confess, our *Author*'s Assertion is stout and generous, that *the Times of* Jaddus *were the* best (with respect to the Virtue of the *Jewish* Church) and not only so, but more superlatively, *the* best that ever were *under the second Temple.* And here (to speak plainly) I doubt our *Author* cannot only not produce one single Writer that ever asserted it,

but

but not one ſingle Man that heretofore or now ever believ'd it. Well, but our *Author* proves it, *The Church was much reform'd by thoſe excellent Men that flouriſhed in the Age next before, namely, by* Nehemiah, Ezra, *and* Malachi: Very good, and therefore I hope the Age *next before*, that was reform'd by theſe *Excellent Men*, was the *beſt that ever was* under the ſecond Temple, and not the Age that follow'd; and yet if any Man looks into the Books of *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, or *Malachi*, he will find ſufficient reaſon to believe, that notwithſtanding the Care and Endeavours of thoſe Excellent Men, the *Jewiſh* Church was very corrupt in their Practices in thoſe times; and there is much more reaſon to believe it, when the Authority and Perſwaſion of thoſe Excellent Men were ceaſed with their Perſons. But our *Author* adds, *At this very time, beſide* Jaddus *himſelf, whom the* Jews *make the laſt of the Men of the* great Synagogue, *there was alſo* Benſira, *as they tell us, a ſhining Light to the* Iſraelites, *and one that much advanc'd the Honour of our God.* But where had our *Author* all this? Why truly out of thoſe very *Jewiſh Chronologers* our *Author* mentions with ſo much ſcorn before, and tells me theſe things *might be excuſed in a Jew*, and even poor *David Ganz* is quoted alſo for it in the Margent. Well, I perceive theſe ſame *Jewiſh Chronologers*, if they write againſt *Joſephus*, they are a Company of baſe and envious Fellows; but if our *Author* can pick any thing out of them for his turn, they may paſs ſo far for good and ſubſtantial Hiſtorians. But after all, our *Author* has made the moſt woeful Conſtruction out of them that ever was made out of any Author: He ſays, *They tell us that* Benſira *was a ſhining Light to the* Iſraelites, *and one that much advanc'd the Honour of our God*; whereas they ſay not one ſuch word of *Benſira*, but of *Simon Juſtus*, and conclude that *Benſira* lived in the days of *Simeon*; *becauſe at the end of his Books, he ſpeaks to the commendation of him, that he was a ſhining Light to the* Iſraelites, *diſpears'd their Darkneſs, and encreas'd the Honour of our God.* (The whole is in the Margent.)

Ganz. p. 58. *Id.* p. 66.

p. 14, 15.

Tempus Benſiræ ignoramus ſed juxta verba autoris Meor enajim *cap.* 22. fuit Benſira diebus Simeonis juſti. Mentionem facit hic Benſira ſub finem libri, à me viſi, Simeonis Juſti, & narrat cum ejus laude quod fuerit Iſraelitis tanquam Lux ſplendens, & quod tenebras ab illis diſpulerit, & auxerit honorem Dei noſtri, *p.* 66.

And our *Author* interprets all this, as ſaid of *Benſira* himſelf. And to make this yet more pleaſant, our *Author* adds, *After them was* Onias *the High Prieſt, and his Son* Simon, *whoſe Praiſe ſwells a Chapter in* Eccleſiaſticus. After whom, I pray? Why, after *Jaddus* and *Benſira*. Now this *Benſira* was the Author of *Eccleſiaſticus*, and after him came *Onias*, and after *Onias* his Son *Simon*; and ſo about two High-Prieſts after himſelf, *Benſira* wrot a whole Chapter in praiſe of *Simon*, I find it is nothing with our *Author*, for a Man to write a whole Chapter in Commendation of another, about 50 Years after he himſelf hath been dead: I hope, all things conſider'd, no Man will hereafter queſtion our *Author*'s Skill in *Chronology*.

Eccl. 50.

Well,

Well, how unluckily ſoever our *Author* proves his Point, yet it may be there may be ſome Argument in it, if times and things could agree, and therefore, for Argument ſake, I do not much care if I grant him (in the preſent Diſpute) that *Jaddus* and *Benſira*, and *Onias*, and his Son *Simon*, were Contemporaries, and flouriſh'd in the *Jewiſh* Church at the ſame time, which is as much as he can deſire, and more than he can prove: I will give him, likewiſe, that each of them *ſwell'd* a whole Chapter in *Eccleſiaſticus* in their Praiſe, as well as one of them; and what then? Therefore the ſtate of the *Jewiſh* Church was not corrupt in their times; this is the Queſtion before us, and it is a pure Proof indeed, for the Virtue of a whole Age, to number three or four Excellent Men that then lived. I could tell him of an Age where there was *Seven Excellent Men*, and of higer ſtations than *Benſira*, which, notwithſtanding, will be no proof, but that that Age was very corrupt, both in their Principles and Practices.

But tho I am willing to grant this, for Argument ſake, it is, I confeſs, more than our *Author* asks, or pretends to prove, and all that he ſays, is, that *Nehemiah*, *Ezra*, and *Malachi*, reformed the Church the *Age before*, and *Jaddus* then lived, and *Benſira* no body knows when, and the Age after that *Onias*, and the Age after him *Simon*, who was a very good Man, according to *Eccleſiaſticus*: So that, after all, our *Author* can find not one in the times of the preſent Controverſie, but even *Jaddus* himſelf, and about whom is the Controverſie. And yet after ſuch Proofs as theſe, he falls on me without Mercy. *His branding of thoſe excellent Men and the Church of God in thoſe times, may teach us to bear the Characters he gives us more patiently: Patiently* does he call it? It is a pure Inſtance of Patience, indeed, to tell me I *brand* Excellent Men, whom I neither named nor thought on, and to make proof of it, to run a whole Age backward and forward to find out Men to make me lay an Imputation on, and yet, forſooth, he bears it *patiently*. And juſt ſuch another Inſtance of the Virtue of *Patience* in what follows, *ſo when he ſaith their Practice* will ſignifie no more to us in this than in their other Immoralities, well this I ſaid, and I thought the thing was plain enough, and if not, why does not our *Author* diſprove it? Why, perhaps his *Patience* will not ſuffer him to do that. But however he tells us, *The meaning is, there muſt be other* Immoralities *in them that differ from him in his Point, ſo here we have a Teſt to try who are, and who are not honeſt Men.* An excellent Conſequence indeed, becauſe the practice in a corrupt ſtate of a Church, is no more a Preſident than their other Immoralities, therefore thoſe that differ from me are *guilty of other Immoralities*. Now, when our *Author*'s hand was in, I wonder he did not charge this matter home, and tell me, becauſe, I ſay, that if this Story be true, *Sanballat* muſt have been 145 Years old, therefore every one that differeth from me in this

Point,

Point, is at leaſt of the Age of 150, or becauſe I ſay, that as *Joſephus* tells the Story, *Jaddus* acted by Divine Revelation; therefore thoſe that differ from me, they are all of them Prophets. And this would have undone me for ever, and I could never have been able to prove it. And when Men are for making Conſequences, they had e'en as good make them to ſome purpoſe: And our *Author*, if he pleaſe, may ſay that I make all them that differ from me, *Alexanders*, or High-Prieſts, or *Jews*, or *Samaritans*, for I mention all theſe words, as that I ſay they *muſt be guilty of other Immoralities.* But this is an invidious Inference, and our *Author* draws it in by the head and ſhoulders, without Connection or Conſequence, I ſuppoſe, by virtue of his *Bearing*, what I ſay *patiently.* Well, I perceive our *Author*'s *Patience* is as *unanſwerable* as his Arguments.

p. 30. At laſt our *Author* takes ſome pains to vindicate *Jaddus* from Immorality, and ſays, *He dare be bold to ſay, he was never taxed with it,* and *that being a Man of that high place in the Church, and of ſo clear a Repute ever ſince in all Ages.* Our *Author* ſpeaks as if he was extraordinary well acquainted with all the Hiſtory of *Jaddus*'s Life; whereas, all that we have of him is from *Joſephus*, and that is ſo little, that for any thing is ſaid there, he might, or he might not be a Man of Virtue. But it is plain enough, that in that corrupt ſtate of the *Jewiſh* Church, the Practices of the High-Prieſts were not ſo exact and regular; *Eliaſhib* built a Chamber in the Temple for an *Ammonite*, and *Johanan* (as *Joſephus* tells us) murder'd his Brother in the Temple, of which *Joſephus* ſaith, *That it was a very great Wickedneſs, and eſpecially in a Prieſt, and ſuch a one as there was not the like to be found among the* Greeks *or* Barbarians: And theſe, I ſuppoſe are no extraordinary Inſtances to recommend the Example of the High-Prieſts in thoſe times. And here my Reaſon comes home, it is plain enough that the High-Prieſts of thoſe times were guilty of very great *Immoralities*, what *News* ſoever it may be to our *Author.* And therefore their Example not to be depended on. Our *Author* ſpeaks of *Jaddus's high ſtation in the Church*, as if his ſtation was higher than his great Grandfather *Eliaſhib*, or than his Father *Johanan.* And therefore our *Author*'s following Queſtion is much to the purpoſe, *What ſhould make the Objector and his Party make ſo light of ſuch an eminent and venerable Example?* For if our *Author* means *eminent* for the ſtation of the Perſon, and *venerable* for the Antiquity; as far as the Example of the High-Prieſt, in theſe times, will reach, *Eliaſhib*'s polluting the Temple with a Stranger, and *Johanan*'s killing his Brother, is every jot as *eminent*, and a little more *venerable* than the Example of *Jaddus.*

Antiq. l. 11. c. 7.

As to what our *Author* ſays of *Jaddus's clear Repute in* all Ages, I muſt needs confeſs there is an honorable mention of him in ſome good Authors. But then, I ſay, it is for that Reſolute and Loyal Anſwer

Joſephus

Joſephus ſays, he ſent to *Alexander*, that *he had taken an Oath to* Darius, and *could not violate it ſo long as* Darius *lived.* But our *Author* and the Dr. have robbed him of that *Honour* and have made it juſt nothing at all, nay, have made him renounce and retract it, as our Author ſaith he *corrected*, Doctor Sherlock *confuted* himſelf *what he ſaid formerly:* and ſo his Anſwer to *Alexander*, is juſt as much to his Reputation as thoſe Principles of the Doctors in the *Caſe of Reſiſtance* are to him, which he alſo *confutes himſelf.* Indeed, as *Joſephus* tells the Story, That what he did afterwards was by *Divine Revelation*; His Honour and Vertue remain intire: and therefore if our Author pleaſe, let his Example be *Eminent* and *Venerable* ſo far as it is an Example, *i. e.* in *ordinary* and *ſtanding Caſes*, as his anſwer to *Alexander* was; but what he did by Revelation is no *Example* at all, nor ſignifies any thing to any Mans Practiſe but in the like Circumſtances; I expect our Author will ſay here as he does before, *As far as the Story will make on his ſide, he is content they ſhould believe it.* But that is but trifling, except he diſprove what I ſay here, That *Jaddus*'s being mentioned with Honour, is with reſpect to that anſwer he returned to *Alexander.* And our Author who inſiſts ſo much upon his *Clear repute in all Ages*, to make that *Repute* ſignifie any thing to his purpoſe, is bound to do one or both of theſe things. 1. To ſhew any Author that mentions *Jaddus* honourably, and with a Character of Vertue, who has not an immediate reference to this anſwer to *Alexander*, i. e. they reckon him vertuous and honourable upon that account. Or 2. That any *Author* mentions him with the ſame additional Characters, with reſpect to his violating his Oath, or acting in contradiction to his former Anſwer. And if our Author can do neither of theſe, (and which I muſt take for granted till I can ſee him prove the contrary; and the firſt of theſe I will engage to make good upon his Requeſt,) then it is plain, that the *Clear Repute of* Jaddus *in all Ages* is not for our Authors purpoſe, but the contrary; and it depends upon that Anſwer *Joſephus* ſaith he gave to *Alexander*, and which *Repute*, our Author hath done all that he can, to take from him. And to ſay no more, *Joſephus* himſelf tells us, that *Anſwer* was of ſo much *Reputation*, as to recommend the *Jewiſh* Nation to the favour of *Ptolomæus Lagi*, and upon confidence of it, to commit to *their* Truſt his Caſtles and Forts, as being Men faithful, and *pertinacious adherers to their Oaths*: and how purely this agrees with the account our Author hath given of it, let the World judge.

Pag. 20.

Antiq. l. 12. c. 1.

I now come to examine what he ſays further upon the general Inference I had made. And he adds, *He tells us, Jaddus* becoming a Subject ject to *Alexander* contrary to his Oath, is no more a Pattern for us to follow, than *Eliaſhib*'s building a Chamber in the Temple for *Tobiah*, is an Argument for us to act contrary to the expreſs Laws of God. Our

Author anſwers; *This is home to the purpoſe, and being ſaid at the firſt, might have ſav'd him, and me all this trouble.* Now, our Author is cer-
Pag. 28. tainly the pleaſanteſt Man alive, for but the Leaf before he tells me of this very Inference, *That he thinks it was put out of its place, and* ought *to come in here for a* Reſerve, *in caſe it appeared that the Story of* Jaddus *was not only true but to our purpoſe,* then *it had been time for him to tell us, that all this is nothing to him and his Party:* and yet in the next Page but one, *if it had been ſaid at firſt, it had ſaved us both ſome trouble.* Now, how is it poſſible for me to pleaſe ſuch an Anſwerer, I put it in the middle, and then it was *out of its place, and ought to come in for a Reſerve.* Our Author himſelf hath put it in for a *Reſerve,* and hath placed it laſt, and then it might have *been ſaid at firſt, and have ſaved him trouble.* But if our Author had been ſo ſparing of his *trouble,* why did not he put it *firſt?* He confeſſes he hath taken it *out of its place*; and by the ſame Reaſon he might have put it where he had pleas'd, or at leaſt, why did not he ſpeak to it where I had placed it? and then it might have *ſaved* him all the remaining part of his *trouble.* But the truth is, had our Author put this firſt, it would have quite ſpoiled all his Book, and have ſhewn how fruitleſs and inſignificant all his Arguments were to vindicate *Joſephus,* and to prove the practiſe of *Jaddus*; for if all his Proofs were admitted (not one of which notwithſtanding, I believe he is ever able to make good) it was utterly inſufficient to determine the Controverſie, and to warrant practiſe in a Point ſo important as that which is before us; for the practiſe if it had been plain, and much leſs if it be doubtful, is not a ſufficient foundation for ſuch a Superſtructure our Author would build on it. And to ſay the truth, for all our Authors talk of *Eminent and venerable Examples,* he hath plainly quitted the Example it ſelf, *i. e.* He hath yielded the Point that I inſiſted on, That the Example of *Jaddus* is inſufficient, and hath put the whole Iſſue upon the nature of the Thing. And this is as much as I can deſire, and my Concluſion is gain'd, tho our Author will not admit the Premiſſes, *That the Example* of *Jaddus* in a Caſe of Conſcience of ſo high a nature is not a ſufficient Warrant and Authority to act upon; and ſo the Controverſie about the vindication of *Joſephus* for the preſent ends. For if there be any difference between the Practiſes of *Eliaſhib* and *Jaddus*; that difference does not ariſe from the differing Examples (for they were both high Prieſts of the ſame Church) but from the nature of their reſpective Actions; That is to ſay, that the Example of *Jaddus* ſignifies no more to us (as it is the Example of a Jewiſh High Prieſt) to transfer Allegiance after an Oath taken to a Prince living, and claiming, than the Example of *Eliaſhib,* does to act contrary to the expreſs Law of God. I know our Author tells
Pag. 32. me, *That the Scriptures ſay one is contrary to the expreſs Law of God, and I*

ſay

ſay the other: and then tells me, *as if we were as well aſſured of what he ſaith, as what we read in Scripture.* But this is all his own, what the Scripture ſaith in the Caſe is matter of another Controverſie. The preſent Queſtion is about the Example of *Jaddus*; and our Author himſelf pretends to juſtifie it from other Topicks, which is a Demonſtration, That that Example will not do it, which was the only thing I had to conſider in that part of the Diſcourſe. And this I think is abundantly ſufficient for the Queſtion before us. But becauſe the Author adds ſomething of another nature, I ſhall alſo briefly conſider that.

He tells us; *Now all the Queſtion is, whether* Jaddus *acted contrary to* Pag. 31.
his Oath to Darius, *in becoming a Subject to* Alexander? *To judge aright of this Queſtion, we muſt conſider what Circumſtances he was in at the taking this Oath, and how they were changed at the time of his ſubmitting to* Alexander.

1. *He was a Subject to* Darius *before the taking of this Oath, and by it, he gave no other Right to* Darius *than what he had before, he gave him only a greater aſſurance.*

2. *That Right that* Darius *had over the* Jews *was no other, than what deſcended to him from* Cyrus; *and that was by his Conqueſt over the* Babylonians, *that were their former Lords.*

3. *That Right of Conqueſt being deſcended to this* Darius, *was won from him by* Alexander *that had overcome him in War, and ſo made himſelf Lord of that Countrey. And ſo* Alexander *now had the ſame Right to their Allegiance which* Darius *had before.*

4. *This Right to their Allegiance being ceaſed, their Oath to him, was of no Obligation; but they were as free, and had as much reaſon to pay their Allegiance now to* Alexander, *as they had formerly to* Darius, *or* Cyrus.

This is all that our *Author* offers in this Point; and I ſhall ſhew him the force of them, by only altering the names, and putting an inſtance with reſpect to the times of King *Charles* the *Firſt*. And then he will ſee how admirably they will look. Suppoſe then a Subject of his who had taken an Oath of Allegiance to him; and ſuppoſe the Circumſtances ſo altered, as between his taking the Oath when hew as on the Throne, and his being beaten at *Naſeby Field*, deliver'd up by the *Scots*, impriſoned, *&c.* and then our Author's Propoſitions will run thus.

1. He was a Subject to King *Charles* before the taking of this Oath, and by it he gave no other Right to King *Charles* than what he had before, he gave him only a greater aſſurance.

2. The Right that King *Charles* had over the People of *England*, was no other than what was deſcended to him from *William* the Conqueror. And that was by his Conqueſt over the *Saxons* that were their former Lords.

3. That Right of Conqueſt being deſcended to King *Charles*, was won from him by *Oliver Cromwel*, that had overcome him in War, and ſo made himſelf Lord of that Countrey; and ſo *Oliver* now had the ſame Right to their Allegiance which King *Charles* had before.

4. His Right to their Allegiance being ceaſed, their Oath to him was of no Obligation; but they were as free, and had as much reaſon to pay their Allegiance now to *Oliver*, as they had formerly to King *Charles*, or *William* the *Conqueror*.

Now I deſire to know of our *Author* which of theſe Propoſitions he will deny? If he will deny none of them, then I perceive had our Author been Governour of a Town for the King in thoſe days, after the fatal Battel at *Naſeby*, he would have had nothing elſe to do, but to put on his *Pontificalia*, and deliver himſelf and his Allegiance over to the
Pag. 32. *Rumpers*, or *Oliver*: for as he ſaith of *Jaddus*, *He had kept his Oath to the laſt, till there was no ſuch King as he had ſworn to.* But if our Author will deny any one of theſe Propoſitions, and ſhew the difference, I will engage he ſhall anſwer himſelf, and do hereby promiſe to make it good.

In the mean time, it is very pleaſant for our *Author* to talk of *Conqueſt*, and yet never take care to ſtate the nature of it, nor to ſhew when and in what Circumſtances, a Right and Title may be obtained by it, but talks of it as looſely, as if the beating an Army in the Field did *ipſo facto* give a Right to the Government, and diſſolve all the former Oaths and Obligations of the Subjects. And if that be the Caſe, methinks our Author ſhould have given ſome reaſon for it, and he may yet do it; for certainly ſome Conqueſts are Invaſions and Robberies, and convey no more Right to a Crown, than a Thief hath to a Purſe, when he hath *conquered* the Right owner. All Men hitherto that have handled the Queſtion of *Conqueſt*, have made a wide diſference between a *Conqueror*, and an *Uſurper*: The latter of which by way of Diſtinction, they call *Raptor* and *Invaſor*, a *Raviſher* and a *Robber*, tho the Government that each of of them have, may be acquired by Victory, and the Force of Arms. And this is our Author's fundamental Miſtake: He will have them all one, and that *Conqueſt* is nothing elſe but Force. He makes Crowns and Empires not ſubject to the Laws of Juſtice and Equity, but ſets them up as a Priſe to be fought for, and there is no more to do, but to *win* them, and wear them. Which is ſuch a Notion of *Conqueſt*, as never was heard of in the Queſtion before us. And I deſire our Author, or any Man elſe to ſhew me one ſingle Author, who treats of the Queſtion, that uſes it in ſuch a ſence. But the truth is, theſe Men who talk at this rate underſtand the word *grammatically*, as if it meant nothing but *beating and Victory*, which is nothing elſe but betraying their ignorance, inſtead of diſ-

puting

puting the Queſtion, and interpreting Terms of Art and Expreſſions in Law by Grammatical conſtruction, and the derivation of words: whereas the ſame word oftentimes varies its meaning in every Art or Science. Now in the preſent Queſtion, *Conqueſt*, whereby a right and Title to a Government is ſuppoſed to be acquired, beſides mere Victory (which as far as I can perceive is all our Author here means by it,) there are ſeveral other neceſſary Conditions and Qualifications: and where they are not, any Perſon, what ſucceſs and Force ſoever he may have, hath not the Title of a Conqueror, but only the Poſſeſſion of an Uſurper. I ſhall not run into the whole of this Queſtion, It will be ſufficient here to obſerve.

1. That that is not a Conqueſt, where is not a juſt cauſe of War preceding. By this I do not mean every juſt cauſe of War, but ſuch a one only as will juſtifie the taking away the Prince, and Peoples Right, *i. e.* when all things conſidered, the taking away that Right is a Reparation equivalent to the Injury; for what is above that is Robbery and Rapine, and can no more give one Prince a Title to another Princes Dominion, than he that takes a thouſand Pound for the injury of ſix pence, hath a juſt Title to the overplus. I know theſe things cannot be adjuſted by Mathematical meaſures; but for all that, there are Rules of Juſtice to be obſerved, tho in ſuch Caſes they may admit of ſome Latitude, and what exceeds them is plain *wrong*, and it is Nonſence to ſay, that *wrong* creates *Right*.

2. That is not a *Conqueſt*, where the Subjects of a Prince are not Conquered, tho he himſelf ſhould be overcome, or taken Priſoner; And this is as clear as any Propoſition in *Euclid*. King *Richard* the Firſt, was taken Priſoner by *Leopold* Duke of *Auſtria*; and did he by vertue of that acquire a Right and Title to the Crown and People of *England?* and it is a pleaſant Buſineſs to ſay, that People are abſolved from their Oaths of Allegiance, and from the duty of Subjects becauſe they are not conquered: and it is a pure Argument to diſſolve the Obligations of Oaths, and to tranſfer Allegiance becauſe they may keep them if they pleaſe, and have power to do their Prince Right whenever they have a mind to it. This is to prove a *Conqueſt*, by denying it: And to ſuppoſe that a Right to a Government and People is conveyed by Conqueſt, when at the ſame time that People is not conquered, is neither more nor leſs, but to ſuppoſe all People out of their wits: and ſuch Doctrines are fit for any thing rather than an Anſwer. I know well enough ſome men ſay here, That it is all one with reſpect to particular Men; if a Nation is not conquered, particular Men are, but it is plain, theſe Men know not what they ſay, and venture their Conſciences upon Fancy and Imagination. They have heard of *Jus Belli*, and a *Right by Conqueſt*, and without conſidering the

the Queſtion, are reſolved to ſuppoſe themſelves conquered, tho at the ſame time they ſuppoſe themſelves conquered by no body but their Fellow Subjects, which is a pure way of *Conqueſt* indeed to convey a Title to the Crown, and conſequently to their Allegiance. Heretofore *Conqueſt* was a terrible thing, and appeared in Blood and Deſtruction, but now 'tis grown as mild and ſoft as can be; and if you have a mind to find it, you muſt not look into the Field, and conſider fighting and the Effects of the Sword, but you muſt ſearch into the moſt peaceable places of the Kingdom, in the Parliament-Houſe, and *Weſtminſter-Hall*, which, I muſt confeſs, of all places a Man would hardly have thought to have found *Conqueſt* in.

3. That is not a *Conqueſt* ſo as to convey a Right and Title to the Dominion of a Country, where the Legal and natural Prince of that Countrey is not deſtroyed, or ſo conquered, as either virtually or expreſly to reſign his Right, and ſubmit to the Conqueror. And this is plainly founded on the eternal and immutable Rules of Equity and Juſtice. For no Man, (let him be under what Force he will) can give away another Man's Right, without his own conſent. If therefore a Prince hath a Right to his Kingdom, no force upon himſelf, much leſs upon his Subjects, can extinguiſh that Right, and till that is extinguiſh'd, a Conqueror can have no right to it: for two oppoſite perſons cannot have the ſame Right to the ſame thing. And here I would ask our Author, who talks ſo pleaſantly of *winning* of *Right*, which way *unjuſt Force* ſhould extinguiſh *juſt Right*. And if this Right be not extinguiſhed, then it remains with him; and if the Right remains with him, then the Conqueror is an unrighteous Poſſeſſor, *i. e.* he hath no Right and Title, for no Man has a Right and Title to what he poſſeſſes unjuſtly. And then I would fain know how Allegiance and Duty ceaſes to Right, and follows Wrong and Injuſtice in oppoſition to Right. But of this our Author and the Reader may be much better inform'd from the Learned Author of the *Duty of Allegiance* in Anſwer to Doctor *Sherlock*.

But after all, what has the Queſtion of *Conqueſt* to do in the Buſineſs? for ſuppoſe *Conqueſt*, in our Author's Notion, would do all theſe wonders, I hope No-Conqueſt would not do all theſe extraordinary matters too. And where, I pray, is this *Conqueſt* they talk on, 'tis inviſible to every body but themſelves. Did ever any Men before diſpute and argue, and take pains to prove themſelves conquered, when the perſon, whom they pretend the Conqueror, and all the Nation beſides perfectly diſowned it? Thoſe that inſiſt upon this Argument, it ſeems as if their Conſciences were hard ſet, when they have nothing to ſay to juſtifie themſelves, but what contradicts their own Eyes and common Senſe. A Man would imagine, a little *Modeſty* without any Reaſon would anſwer ſuch Arguments. And if they can ſtop the Mouth of their Conſciences

ſciences with Chimera's and *Figments*, much good may it do them. Should any ſober Foreigner hear of the *abdicating* Vote', of giving and accepting the Crown, and the Revenue belonging to it, of confining the Soveraign Power, and limiting the Succeſſion, *&c.* And at the ſame time hear of a ſort of Divines that were might and main ſtretching their Wits to prove that a *Conqueſt*, I believe he would think ſomething or other which I will not name, for certainly ſuch a Conqueſt was never heard of, when the Conqueror muſt take Terms from the Conquered. For my part, I think Men that talk at this rate are to be looked upon as the Betrayers of *Engliſh Liberty* and Property. For how much ſoever they may play with it, *Conqueſt* is a very hard word, and means no leſs than a Title to the Property of the whole Kingdom. And all theſe Arguments plainly centre in this, That whatever was done and tranſacted in the *Convention* was nothing elſe but *Mercy* and *Condeſcenſion* in the Prince, and he vouchſafed to accept of the Crown upon theſe Terms, when it was his own before by the Rights of War. So that by theſe Mens Arguments, the Sovereign Power not being as abſolute as in *France* or *Turkey*, and the Property of the whole Kingdom is pure free Gift, and Gracious Condeſcenſion; which is a Tenure not very grateful to *Engliſh* Men. And I have often wondered, that a Nation ſo jealous of its Liberties and Privileges, would ſuffer ſuch Doctrines and Arguments to paſs abroad without *Publick Animadverſion*. And therefore in Defence of the Liberties of my Native Country, which theſe Arguments totally overthrow and betray, I will enter the Liſt with him when he pleaſes. And to make good his Hypotheſis, here are two things for him to prove.

1. That Conqueſt, in his Notion, that is, Force, Power or Victory is a ſufficient Title to Dominion and Government, and gives a juſt Right to it.

2. That the Revolution here is a Conqueſt, the one is a general Doctrine, and the other the Application of it to the particular Caſe. And when our Author hath done theſe, by the Grace of God, he ſhall hear what Anſwer I have to return. For the preſent, I ſhall take my leave of our Author, and of his Argument from Conqueſt, with this one Remark, *That thoſe who have been early in a Revolution, and have ſet their Heads and Shoulders to it. For them to juſtifie their Compliances by Conqueſt is abominable* Hypocriſie *before God and Man.*

FINIS.